1-1-1970

A study of various factors in Head Start and Title I programs in twenty school districts.

Cornell Theodore Lewis
University of Massachusetts Amherst

A STUDY OF VARIOUS FACTORS IN HEAD START AND TITLE I PROGRAMS IN TWENTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A Dissertation Presented

By

Cornell Theodore Lewis

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

December, 1970

Major Subject - Education

A STUDY OF VARIOUS FACTORS IN HEAD START AND TITLE I PROGRAMS IN TWENTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A Dissertation

By

Cornell Theodore Lewis

Approved as to style and content by:

DR. ARTHUR EVE, Chairman of Committee

DR. DWIGHT ALLEN, Head of Department

DR. DAVID FLIGHT, Member

DR. RICHARD CLARK, Member

DR. DAVID YARINGTON, Member

December, 1970

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to

my wife,

Joan,

my children,

Patsy and Cornell, Jr.

and

my mother

Daisy

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In conducting the study which follows, the writer had the opportunity of working during the past year with numerous individuals. From contacts with them, I have been inspired. It was necessary, in addition to examining a wide range of printed materials and collecting original data, to utilize the knowledge and services of these individuals. Therefore, the writer is deeply indebted to many persons whose contributions added greatly to the completion of this study and whose cooperation and advice provided invaluable data and materials. They include:

Mrs. Mary Jo Borreson, Editor, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland, for proofreading the entire manuscript

The Honorable Edward W. Brooke, United States Senator from Massachusetts

Dr. Lois-ellen Datta, Chief, Research and Evaluation Section, Project Head Start, Office of Child Development, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Richard Fairley, Director of Compensatory Education, Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Samuel Goodman, Director of Research, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland

Mr. Leon Jones, Student, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

Dr. Jenny Klein, Senior Education Specialist, Office of Child Development, Washington, D. C.

Dr. George Thomas, Area Director of Instruction, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland

Members of the Dissertation Advisory Committee:

Dr. Arthur Eve, Associate Professor of Education
Dr. Richard Clark, Assistant Professor of Education
Dr. David Yarrington, Assistant Professor of Education

Dissertation Consultants:

Dr. David Flight, Assistant Professor of Education
Dr. Thomas Hutchinson, Assistant Professor of Education

LIST OF TABLES

THE TABLES FOR PART I DEALT WITH THE QUESTIONS CONCERNING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES FOUND IN THE TWENTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS UNDER INVESTIGATION

THE TABLES FOR PART II DEALT WITH THE QUESTIONS CONCERNING WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS IN SCHOOLS RECEIVING HEAD START PUPILS

Table No.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Emphasis during the past decade has been on the improvement of education for young children. During this period, early childhood education became a national priority which required extensive comprehensive programming. Research indicated that early intervention was essential. Cawley et al.,[1] Gray and Klaus,[2] and Karnes[3] were among many researchers in recent years who presented supportive evidence to this fact. The stimulus for such a need came as a result of the increased awareness that reaching children early will significantly affect their intellectual and social growth. In an effort to improve the quality of life for the young disadvantaged child and his family, concentrated and coordinated efforts on the part of federal, state, and local agencies became necessary. Hence, early childhood programs emerged to provide educational, social, and cultural experiences for this segment of the populous. The writer believes such programs will help bridge the gap between the level of educa-

---

[1]John F. Cawley et al., "An Appraisal of Head Start Participants and Non-Participants: Expanded Considerations on Learning Disabilities Among Disadvantaged Children," (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1968).

[2]Susan Gray and Rupert Klaus, "The Early Training Project: A Seventh Year Report" (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1969).

[3]Merle B. Karnes et al., "A Longitudinal Study of Disadvantaged Children Who Participated in Three Different Preschool Programs" (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1969).

tion and the childrens' abilities to cope with a rapidly changing society.

Project Head Start was among these emerging early childhood education programs. The record shows that "Head Start was one of the first parts of the Johnson Administration's War on Poverty."[4] Since 1965, this project has played a significant role in establishing educational programs for low-income children and effecting change in existing programs for disadvantaged preschool children. Title I, included in the other federally sponsored programs, has as a part of its emphasis an early childhood education component.[5] Numerous changes have been made in the American school's environment, curriculum, approaches to learning, parent and community relationships, and the organizational structure due to increased emphasis on early childhood education.

Statement of the Problem

Head Start children are given one year of intensified programming which attempts to meet their sociological, emotional, physical and educational needs. It was believed that this comprehensive approach would immensely affect the future life styles of disadvantaged children and their families.

---

[4]Marshall Smith and Joan S. Bissell, "Report Analysis: The Impact of Head Start" Harvard Educational Review, 40, 1 (February, 1970), p. 54.

[5]Title I is part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

In an attempt to find educational strategies best suited to assure the continuation of this comprehensive approach, changes must take place within the public schools receiving these children.

The purpose of this study was to examine various aspects of public school programs presently using funds from Title I, to determine what changes have evolved due to the operations of Head Start. It was the intent of this study to focus on:

1. The organizational changes taking place, as a direct result of Head Start, within schools receiving Title I funds.

2. The working relationship between the Head Start staff and appropriate Title I school personnel receiving Head Start pupils.

3. A comparison of various factors of the Head Start program with similar factors of the Title I program in twenty school districts.

4. The extent of parent involvement in the regular school program as a continuation of their Head Start involvement.

Significance of the Study

Special programs for the disadvantaged or culturally deprived child emerged during the early 1960's, largely as a response to the civil rights movement. The Economic

Opportunity Act of August, 1964, was one of the key measures in the federal administration's "war on poverty." As a result, Project Head Start began during the summer of 1965. Head Start was designed "to improve the health and physical ability of poor children; to develop their self-confidence and ability to relate to others; to increase their verbal and conceptual skills; to involve parents in activities with their children; and to provide appropriate social services for the family in order that the child of poverty may begin his school career on more nearly equal terms with his more fortunate classmates."[6]

It has become increasingly clear to educators that if young people being educated today are to be capable of functioning satisfactorily in an increasingly complex society in years to come, efforts must be made to implement Head Start objectives in the main stream of public school education. Investigators such as Deutsch and Deutsch,[7] and Wolff and Stein[8] have indicated that the stimulus for this

---

[6]Office of Economic Opportunity, Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs (Washington, D. C.: The Office June 1, 1967), p. 554.

[7]Cynthia Deutsch and Martin Deutsch, "Theory of Early Childhood Environment Programs," in R. Hess and R. Bear, Eds., Early Education: Current Theory, Research and Action (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 66-73.

[8]Max Wolff and Annie Stein, "Study I: Six Months Later. A Comparison of Children Who Had Head Start Summer 1965, with their Classmates in Kindergarten (A Case Study of Kindergartens in Four Public Elementary Schools, New York City)," OEO Project 141-61 166 (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1966).

need has come as a result of the heightened awareness that reaching children at an earlier age will affect both their intellectual and social growth significantly. Project Head Start cannot in itself accomplish this much desired goal. It can be stated confidently, however, that Project Head Start has made some positive gains toward (1) new awakening regarding the value of education at an early age; and (2) both ways and means of implementing early childhood education programs within an established school system.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides funds from the federal government to the state boards of education for allocation to local school districts for special programs to broaden and strengthen educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged children in those geographic areas where low-income families are concentrated. In many communities, children who have participated in Head Start entered public schools receiving these additional services from Title I; therefore, coordination is essential.

Concern with early education was closely related to the assumption that the earliest years generally have the most impact in formation of life styles. Susan Gray has continually pointed this out over the past six years in reports on the DARCEE Early Training Project.[9] There was general

---

[9]Susan Gray, "The DARCEE Early Training Project" (Nashville: George Peabody College, 1967).

agreement that early childhood education has a definite value and that early intervention in the child's life is a highly effective means by which educational, psychological, sociological and emotional problems can be reduced. It was quite clear as a result of the Westinghouse study that there was a definite need for follow-up studies on the Head Start program's medical and nutritional impact, as well as the effects on the stability of the family and community.[10] Further, the study indicated that there was a need for an assessment of the morale and attitudes of children who participated in Head Start.

Limitation of the Study

Project Head Start has been an experiment to discover intervention techniques in order to develop proficiency in language and cognitive skills and to improve attitudes and overall development of young disadvantaged children and their families. In view of the fact that Head Start has been in operation only since 1965, it was reasonable to assume that there was an urgent need for many exploratory studies. Before massive research can be done, investigations, such as this study, are considered crucial. Such studies provide baseline data necessary to the assessment of this project

---

[10]Westinghouse Learning Corporation-University of Ohio, The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start Experiences on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development, OEO Contract No. B89-4536 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

and other programs of this nature. Therefore, this study was designed to collect baseline data and to make some generalizations from a descriptive analysis of the data presented.

This study included twenty selected school systems in the United States that were known to include children who have participated in Project Head Start and have subsequently enrolled in schools utilizing Title I funds. The sampling took place in thirteen states and involved urban and rural programs both large and small.

This specific study was designed to conduct sixty personal interviews which involved three individuals from each program. The interviews were confined to (1) directors of Head Start, (2) parents of children who have participated in Head Start, and (3) school officials responsible for programming for Headstarters entering Title I schools. The rationale for this selection was to keep the group at a manageable size allowing for personal interviews, while also maintaining a balanced cross-section of programs, geographical areas, and individuals that were directly involved with children who have participated in Project Head Start.

Since Head Start and Title I were still in their earlier stages, the information presented in this study was useful as supportive rather than conclusive evidence of the effectiveness of the program's impact. Therefore, the final and perhaps most important limitation of this study relates to

the scope of the interview-questionnaire aspect. This study was confined within the range and domain of the information contained on the questionnaire, which was developed and pretested.

Procedures

A descriptive survey method of research utilizing a questionnaire-interview technique was used to collect data for analysis and to produce a general description of the programs involved. The following procedures were used to gather data for this study:

1. Review of the literature pertaining to early childhood education with particular attention given to studies dealing with the disadvantaged and the Head Start Program. Basic references for defining the problem included:
   a. Review of Research 1965 to 1969, a publication by the Office of Economic Opportunity which provides summaries of studies and research in Project Head Start
   b. A Report on Evaluation Studies of Project Head Start, paper presented at the 1969 convention of the American Psychological Association
   c. A Task Force Report on Title I, 1969, USOE
   d. Education Index

e. Readers Guide to Periodic Literature

f. Dissertation Abstracts

g. Encyclopedia of Educational Research

h. Documents, ERIC Clearinghouse

2. Personal interviews were held with Dr. Lois-ellin Datta, National Coordinator, Head Start Evaluation; Dr. Jenny Klein, Senior Education Specialist, Project Head Start; Miss Sheila Platoff, Program Officer, Title I; and Mr. Richard Fairley, National Director, Title I. These interviews were held to define problem areas.

3. A question guide was designed to collect data concerning the following information about the recipient public schools in this sample:[11]

a. To identify organizational changes taking place in school receiving Head Start pupils

b. To identify working relationships between Head Start personnel and regular school staff

---

[11]Thomas E. Hutchinson, Unpublished Paper, "Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts," School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1969. (These concepts were modified for the development of this question guide by one of the author's doctoral candidates, Leon Jones, together with the writer to accommodate the specific intent of this instrument.)

members assigned to Title I schools; e.g., joint training programs, conferences, observations, and exchange of pertinent data.

c. To establish the degree of emphasis on continuous parent-school relations of Head Start parents. (See Appendix A.)

4. The questions were pretested on two consultants to Project Head Start, a curriculum specialist in early childhood education, two directors of Head Start, a director of Title I, two parents of Head Start children, and three teachers of whom two taught kindergarten and worked with disadvantaged children. The questions were also reviewed critically by a research supervisor assigned to the Department of Research, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland; and a professor and a doctoral student in the Center for Educational Research, School of Education, University of Massachusetts.

5. Telephone calls were made to schedule interviews with school districts requesting participation.

6. A follow-up letter was sent to each selected participant, requesting his cooperation in obtaining the data necessary to complete this study. (See Appendix B.)

7. Personal interviews were conducted with an accompanying question-guide, as described above, with sixty persons closely associated with children who had progressed from Head Start into the regular public school program.

8. The returns were edited, tabulated, and summarized according to the following manner:
   a. Data were coded and key punched on IBM Key Punch cards to allow tabulation by electronic equipment.
   b. A descriptive analysis of the data was presented.

9. Data were summarized, conclusions drawn, and recommendations made.

Underlying Assumptions

The following assumptions are considered essential to the purpose of this study:

1. Where there are children from disadvantaged backgrounds, it is essential that social, psychological, and health services, along with a nutrition program and cultural experiences, be considered in the curriculum design for early childhood education. If sociological, emotional, physical, and educational factors are considered as a part of the program, the author assumes that changes will be ef-

fected.

2. Early intervention is necessary in order to improve the quality of education for all American young children.

3. The basic concept of Head Start has its greatest potential for effecting change within the public school provided there is adequate program coordination and communication between Head Start staffs and Title I public school staffs receiving Head-starters. This assumption is influenced by the fundamental premise that good coordination and communication between Head Start and Title I programs will set into motion a process aimed at producing a meaningful educational program for disadvantaged children.

Definition of Terms

Comprehensive Education. A design to meet the sociological, emotional, physical, and educational needs of children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Disadvantaged. Used to refer to the child who has been deprived of the tools and the resources at home necessary to make him successful in school.

Early Childhood Education. A program designed to accelerate the cognitive and intellectual and social development of young children between the ages of three and eight

years.

Head Start. A child development program funded under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, intended to provide the preschool disadvantaged child with educational and cultural experiences along with medical and dental services and nutrition programs.

Office of Economic Opportunity. An office established within the organizational structure of the Office of the President of the United States to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Organizational Changes. Alternative designs used to effect ways of regulating the progression of children through an educational program.

Parent Involvement. The participation of parents in determining the structure and content of their children's educational program.

Title I. A program designed to broaden and strengthen educational opportunities for educationally deprived children living in school attendance areas where there is a high concentration of children from low-income families.

"War on Poverty." The anti-poverty program pursued under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Westinghouse Study. A study developed to measure the extent to which first, second, and third grade children who had attended Head Start preschool programs differed in their intellectual and socio-personal development from comparable

children who did not attend.

Working Relationship. The cooperative efforts by which the Head Start staff and regular school personnel who received children after they had participated in the project worked in an attempt to coordinate resources for disadvantaged children.

Abbreviations Used

ACEI - Association for Childhood Education, International

ESEA - Elementary Secondary Education Act

ETS - Educational Testing Services (Princeton, N. J.)

HEW - Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

IBM - International Business Machines

NEA - National Education Association

OEO - Office of Economic Opportunity

PAC - Policy Advisory Committee

USOE - United States Office of Education

C H A P T E R I I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents a review of the literature pertaining to early childhood education with particular reference to the disadvantaged. Specific attention has been given to research as it relates to Head Start and the Title I Early Childhood Education component. An attempt has been made to select the most significant literature related to the writer's study. This chapter has been divided into two parts. Part I gives a general description of programs for the disadvantaged, which is referred to herein as Compensatory Education Programs. Emphasis is on the effectiveness of these programs as well as on their limitations. An overview of these programs and their impacts is discussed in detail. Part II deals with the specific impact of Head Start and Title I on the child, with some emphasis given to family and community impact. The following categories of early childhood education are dealt with: cognitive development; social development; parent and community participation; and follow-up studies and demonstration projects.

PART I - PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The past decade has seen the rise of programs seeking to make significant differences in the lives of the poor. Some researchers have reported during this period that compensatory education programs have failed. For example, Head Start was mentioned by Jensen as an ineffective compensatory education program,[1] and he stated that educators should seek to find new strategies in an effort to improve the quality of life for the young disadvantaged child. Jencks urged that an attempt be made to move away from the schools to other scenes, particularly programs involving the total family.[2] He suggested that program sponsors should look to other places within the neighborhood which may be more closely related to the family as a unit.

There were a number of researchers on the other hand who felt that educators were too hasty in writing off compensatory education programs, particularly in turning away from efforts to understand the effects of intervening at an early age. Hunt supported the argument that some compensatory education programs were at least a fair success, and that sufficient data has not yet been received in order to

---

[1]Arthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, 39, 1-123, 1968.

[2]Christopher Jencks, "Some Natural Experiments in Compensatory Education." Mimeo: paper presented at SRCD meeting, April 15, 1969.

justify the assumption that more recent compensatory education programs were ineffective.[3] Kagan also made a strong plea for more time to adequately assess remedial programs.[4] To further illustrate how little is known about details of program effectiveness for the disadvantaged young child, McDill, McDill, and Sprehe wrote:

> ...Compensatory educational programs have been put in a position never demanded of educators before. No public school system has ever before been abolished because it could not teach children to read and write. Yet compensatory programs, aimed at the very children who are going to be losers in the regular school program, are in just this situation. The programs are being asked to succeed in a shorter time than that which the regular school systems have had. Perhaps this is healthy. Insisting on nothing less than success as a condition of survival is indeed a great motivator for achieving success. But outright condemnation of all compensatory programs should be tempered by a realization of the magnitude of the task with which they are confronted and the short time they have been coping with the task.[5]

Bloom, at the conclusion of an extensive longitudal study, found that 50 percent of all growth in human intelligence takes place between birth and age four.[6] Another

---

[3]James McV. Hunt, "Comments on Jensen," Harvard Educational Review, 39, 2, 1969, pp. 20-34.

[4]Jerome Kagan, "Comments on Jensen," Harvard Educational Review, 39, 2, 1969, pp. 20-34.

[5]Edward L. McDill, Mary S. McDill, and J. Timothy Sprehe, "An Analysis of Evaluations of Selected Compensatory Education Programs." Mimeo: Paper presented at Evaluation of Social Action Programs Conference, May 2-3, 1969.

[6]Benjamin S. Bloom, Stability and Change in Human Characteristics (New York: Wiley, 1964), pp. 12-20.

30 percent occurs between the ages four and eight; and the remaining 20 percent takes place between the ages eight and seventeen, at which point the development of intelligence was complete. He also concluded from the longitudal studies that results in general achievement, reading comprehension, and vocabulary development show that 33 percent of the general achievement pattern that will be attained by age eighteen has developed by age six when the child enters school, 50 percent by age nine, and 75 percent by the time the child is about age thirteen and in grade seven.

Miller noted that various groups of four-year-old children from disadvantaged environments have gained 15 to 20 points on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test over a one year intervention period.[7] He reported that this was consistent with other findings and appears to be about the highest level which was generally obtained. The real goal was to maintain these gains over a period of time so that the usual picture of progressive decline does not emerge.

Deutsch reported on a five year intervention study involving young disadvantaged children at the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York.[8] The major effort was directed toward its enrichment program which was designed

---

[7]James O. Miller, Diffusion of Intervention Effects in Disadvantaged Families, ERIC Occasional Paper (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1969).

[8]Martin Deutsch, Report, Five Year Intervention Study, (New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, 1968).

to provide a group of inner-city children from prekindergarten through third grade with a curriculum aimed at preventing and/or alleviating some of the detrimental elements within the areas of curriculum development, training of teaching and supervisory personnel, demonstration, evaluation, and research. The study's findings clearly demonstrated that continuous and carefully planned intervention procedures can have a substantially positive influence on the performance of young disadvantaged children. This study was expanded later to include a large enough sample of children, whereby comparisons in future analysis should demonstrate the effects of intervention even more clearly.

Despite the successful programs mentioned herein, there were many who criticized programs for the disadvantaged. Among those was Cohen who pointed out that although school systems have made organizational changes, little has happened in the way of innovations or restructuring in the basic teaching process.[9] Another way of stating this criticism is that compensatory education programs have concentrated heavily upon the deficiencies of children, and have neglected to give serious attention to the deficiencies of schools. Cohen summarizes his position by stating:

> ...So much has been made of the deprivations children are supposed to have inflicted upon

---

[9]David K. Cohen, "Compensation and Integration," Harvard Educational Review, 38, 3, 1968, p. 67.

> the schools that hardly any serious thought has been given to the institutional deficiencies of schools which regularly are inflicted upon children.

In the Coleman Report it was found that the quality of education for the disadvantaged child was closely related to teacher characteristics which showed a close relation to student performance.[10] These teacher characteristics were social class origin, verbal ability, and background or quality of education. Teacher characteristics were most frequently mentioned as having the greatest impact in determining the kinds of learning young children acquire and, indeed, the types of social behaviors the children develop. Educators generally agree that while teachers were somewhat limited by their own biases in assessing children, their capacity to be resourceful, flexible, and supportive was important to the young child's development. This position was strongly supported by Bruner, who emphasized that the teacher was also an immediately personal symbol of the educational process, one with whom students can easily identify and compare themselves.[11]

In a testimony in Washington, D. C., on April 20, 1970, before the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Kenneth B. Clark reemphasized his position that

---

[10]James S. Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966)

[11]Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education, (New York: Random House, 1960), p. 90.

poor academic attainment of the young disadvantaged child was due largely to the inferior quality of schools in low income areas.[12] There was strong evidence to support Clark's charges, notably the Commission on Civil Rights' findings in its publication Racial Isolation in the Public Schools.[13] In most instances within its examination of three compensatory education programs, the data did not show significant gains in achievement.

Bereiter and Englemann (who are widely known both for their concern for very young children and more recently for the educational needs of disadvantaged children) have observed that Clark's charges may be legitimate;[14] but at the same time they claimed that he has overlooked the fact that disadvantaged children are already well below average in academic abilities at the time they enter school. If this is the case, then schools for the disadvantaged must provide a higher quality of education at a faster-than-normal rate so that children may catch up. In order for schools to deal realistically with the educational problems of the disadvantaged child, there seem to be two alternatives: (1) either

---

[12]Testimony before the United States Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Washington, D. C., 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., April 20, 1970.

[13]A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in Public Schools, 1 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

[14]Carl Bereiter and Siegfried Engelmann, An Academically Oriented Preschool for Culturally Deprived Children, Mimeographed Report (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1965), pp. 68-72.

to accelerate learning, as Bereiter and Englemann have suggested; or (2) to bring children into the learning process at an earlier age while at the same time improving the quality of the schools that disadvantaged children attend.

In view of the increasing emphasis on early childhood education programs (e.g., Head Start and Title I), the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has created and organized the Office of Child Development, designed specifically to coordinate all early childhood education programs.

Fantini suggested that compensatory education was a mere prescription that deals with symptoms, with graduated doses that have been ineffective, consisting of increased trips, increased remedial reading, etc. without effecting real differences of any nature.[15] At present, compensatory education seems essentially augmenting and strengthening existing programs rather then re-examining the total school situation.

In a highly controversial article on his genetic hypothesis, Jensen recently suggested that compensatory education programs by and large have failed to achieve their expected goals.[16] As a result of Jensen's article thesis, there has been a renewed search for positive findings which would refute that part of this widely publicized study in

---

[15]Mario D. Fantini et al., The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 112.

[16]Jensen (See footnote 1, this chapter.)

which he presented a description of Blacks as genetically inferior.

Cicirelli et al. had as their focus in the Westinghouse-Ohio study the cognitive and affective development of Head Start enrollees.[17] They attempted to get immediate information for the purpose of justifying Head Start's existence. The results were disappointing in that they did not elicit favorable findings as expected. Smith and Bissell stated that the Westinghouse-Ohio study supported Arthur Jensen's argument that the disadvantaged, with particular reference to Blacks, were genetically inferior in the development of cognitive skills.[18]

In summary, the evidence indicated that there was a source of confusion as to the future direction of compensatory education programs with particular reference to young children. It was clear that adding personnel, increasing special services, and obtaining more equipment will not alone constitute successful compensatory education programs. The best strategy has by no means been found. There still

---

[17]Victor G. Cicirelli et al., The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development, Westinghouse Learning Corporation and the University of Ohio under contract B89-4536, June 20, 1968, with the Office of Economic Opportunity (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, June 12, 1969).

[18]Marshall S. Smith and Joan S. Bissell, "The Impact of Head Start: The Westinghouse-Ohio Head Start Evaluation," Harvard Educational Review, 40, 1, 1970, pp. 51-103.

has not been sufficient time for assessing massive social experimental programs which have been developed (e.g., Project Head Start, Title I, and Project Follow Through) in order to determine their success or failure.

Prior to the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, evaluation consisted almost exclusively of small programs concerned with such matters as curriculum development or teacher training. However, studies since 1964 have been confronted with programs of an exploratory nature involving massive social experiment in order to explore ways of intervening in early developmental learning processes. It is the opinion of the writer that among the emerging programs, there seems to be an indication that some will be evaluated in terms of positive, easily identifiable changes. New discoveries serve to redirect efforts along alternative routes. As new programs emerge, hopefully new ideas will be generated to focus attention in new directions.

PART II - IMPACT OF HEAD START AND TITLE I

The national thrust for large-scale early childhood programs began to emerge in the mid-1960's when the federal government established two major programs, Project Head Start and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. These massive educational programs differ from the traditional objective of other programs for children in several important respects. (1) They are social action programs designed to explore ways of intervening in the early developmental processes in order to improve the abilities, attitudes, health, and emotional stability of young children and their families. (2) The programs were not directed at schools or school districts, but rather at improving the quality of education for disadvantaged children throughout the nation. (3) They were created by Congress, and administrative guidelines were developed by federal agencies and not by local school personnel. Conceptual problems associated with clarifying ideas accounted for the relatively slow progress in research of these massive social experiments. Compounding these research problems was the newness of these programs. Relatively little was known about details of program operation for young children prior to these developments. Since more than forty years of related research has failed to produce definitive answers, (see, for example Hunt, Fuller, and

Swift) very little was known about programs for the poor.[19]

The review of the research and demonstration projects for Head Start and Title I was presented according to five categories: (1) cognitive development, (2) social development, (3) parent involvement, (4) community involvement, and (5) follow-up.

Cognitive Development

One of the major objectives of both Head Start and Title I was improving the linguistic and cognitive skills of the disadvantaged child. The writer believes that intervention rests on these deficits which must be corrected if the child is going to succeed in school. Cognitive or intellectual development and achievement have long been recognized as important predictors of academic success in school. Early studies of both programs provided mixed findings about the cognitive effects. It must be pointed out, however, that careful analysis of test items and use of various tests suggested wide variations in children's performance. There have been serious questions about the accuracy of available assessment instruments as predictors of academic achievement among

---

[19]James McV. Hunt, Intelligence and Experience (New York: Ronald, 1961), p. 39.

John L. Fuller, Behavior Genetics (New York: Wiley, 1960), p. 140.

James W. Swift, "Effects of Early Group Experience: The Nursery School and Day Nursery," Review of Child Development Research, M.L. and L.W. Hoffman, Eds. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964), pp. 107-110.

children. There have been some attempts to construct tests which will more accurately measure cognitive or intellectual development and achievement of disadvantaged children. Among those who have constructed especially designed tests were Franklin and Cobb who developed a test to gather data on non-verbal behavior in young children.[20] The test was designed for four-year-olds, with test items organized into three categories: (1) play situation, (2) imitation, (3) spatial arrangement, and (4) picture-object matching. These tests were used to make comparisons between disadvantaged and middle class children. Zimiles and Asch attempted to develop a Matrix Test to measure cognitive skills associated with inferential reasoning.[21] They found the test a useful tool for obtaining data relevant to the early development of disadvantaged children.

A majority of studies on Head Start reported an immediate impact; data from the most recent studies of full year programs indicated that performance tested immediately after involvement in Head Start programs reached the national averages on tests of general ability and learning readiness. Alexander and Faust found this to be true while using the

---

[20]Margery Franklin and Judith Cobb, "Document 3: An Experimental Approach to Studying Non-Verbal Representation in Young Children," (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1967).

[21]Herbert Zimiles and Harvey Asch, "Document I: Development of the Matrix Test," (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1967).

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test.[22] They found that there was some indication that the final level of achievement was a function of the length of time in the program. There was evidence which suggested that some changes took place in children attending Head Start programs. This acceleration in rate of intellectual development was not sustained when entering regular school. Chorost et al. found evidence to support this hypothesis after testing former Headstarters at the end of kindergarten and first grade.[23] Grotberg concluded that regardless of findings on I.Q. gains, children who participated in Head Start were often likely to enter school with a greater cognitive and social readiness for learning.[24] In full year Head Start programs, this readiness may reach or exceed the national average on general test measures.

The greatest emphasis in achievement for implementors of Title I centers around pupils' gains in language or numerical skills. The American Institute of Research, under a contract

---

[22]Theron Alexander, "The Language of the Children in the 'Inner City'," (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1968).

Margaret Faust, "Five Pilot Studies: Concerned with Social-Emotional Variables Affecting Behavior of Children in Head Start," (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1968).

[23]Sherwood B. Chorost, et al., "An Evaluation of the Effects of a Summer Head Start Program," Childhood Research Information Bulletin, Wakoff Research Center, Staten Island, New York, OEO-516 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

[24]Edith Grotberg, Review of Research: 1965 to 1969. OEO Pamphlet 1608-13 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

with the United States Office of Education and in consultation with the National Advisory Council on Education of Disadvantaged Children, identified 21 programs for study.[25] These programs were chosen on the basis of their having produced significant cognitive achievement gains on the part of the pupils enrolled in them.

Significant gains were made by pupils who participated in the 21 programs. It must be kept in mind that these projects were carefully selected to reflect successful programs. It must also be remembered that the researchers termed those projects successful which emphasized cognitive gains. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children raised an important and relevant question concerning the result of this study:

> Should programs for the education of disadvantaged children focus only on cognitive gains? Will an enhanced ability in reading and numbers suffice to enable the children of the poor to break the cycle of disadvantaged conditions in which they are caught up?[26]

Improved cognitive ability is crucial and perhaps--given the continuing limitation on resources--deserves the highest priority among all those needs which the Council and others have identified as pertaining to disadvantaged children. The goal of cognitive achievement (which seems clearly

---

[25]TITLE I ESEA, A Review and a Forward Look, Report, (Washington, D. C.: National Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, 1969).

[26]See footnote 25, this chapter.

discrete because it is easily comprehensible) probably will not itself be reached if other needs are completely ignored.

In summary, disadvantaged children were performing below middle class children in the cognitive, intellectual and achievement levels. However, there was a question concerning the use of measurement instruments, which suggests that a careful analysis of test items and use of various tests should be studied. The need for the construction of new tests, more sensitive to the disadvantaged population, was clearly reflected in numerous studies. Disadvantaged children seem to be able to develop cognitive skills more rapidly after participating in Head Start and other special training activities. The point of intervention was still unknown.

Social Development

The writer feels that social, emotional, and psychological behavior of children is closely associated with cognitive, intellectual and achievement behavior of children. There was general agreement about child development, that children's learning was enhanced when they have a positive self-image, relate well to others, and are happy. There were some studies in which attempts were made to test this assumption. For example, Beller studied emotional dependency of young disadvantaged children with adult figures, a highly important relationship in the learning process.[27] There was a

---

[27]Kuno Beller, "Study I: Use of Multiple Criteria to Evaluate Effects of Early Educational Intervention on Subsequent School Performance," (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1968).

comparison made between lower class children and middle class children. He found that in contrast to middle class children, there was very little consistency in lower class children's manifestation of emotion dependency. This was found to be particularly true for boys. This study concluded that children who have a dependency conflict scored lower on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, and the Draw-A-Man Test than children who do not have a dependency conflict.

In one of the most comprehensive evaluations ever done on Title I programs, Jordan reported that in order to enhance the child's self-image, there must be a high level of student involvement in the learning process.[28] He stated that:

> ...It has been found that learning on the part of the disadvantaged can be greatly facilitated if they do not have to remain recipients of information, but in fact can become involved in doing things.

For this reason, Jordan was interested in ascertaining whether or not projects employed means of involving younsters and making them more active participants in the learning process through games, dramatics, role playing, and the use of peers as teachers.

He found that the systematic approach to the development of children's self-image was not encouraging in the

---

[28]Daniel C. Jordan, Compensatory Education in Massachusetts: An Evaluation with Recommendations (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1970).

data collected throughout the state of Massachusetts. Role playing, utilizing students as teachers of their peers, and the use of multi-media presentations were found in less than 15 percent of the projects. Only 16 percent of the projects used dramatics of some kind as a means of enhancing learning in various aspects of the program. More encouraging, however, was the use of various games, where approximately 50 percent of the projects utilized this technique in the development of the learning process.

Schwartz, in a study of the effects of peer relationships and interactions, tested whether or not nursery school children placed in a friendly situation would score higher than children who had no close peers.[29] He found that children in the friendly situation played longer with toys, played more quickly with new toys, and adjusted to play situations more easily than children without friendly peers. He concluded that this feeling of security enhances comfort rating, mobility, verbalization, and strength of preference for novel toys. Its value was obvious for contributing to desirable conditions for learning.

In a two year demonstration project, Nimnicht et al. had as their major focus the development of a positive self-image in disadvantaged young children by designing an organized autotelic responsive environment.[30] (An autotelic activity

---

[29]J. Conrad Schwartz, "Presence of An Attached Peer and Security in a Novel Environment" (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1968).

[30]Glen Nimnicht et al., "Research on The New Nursery School: Interim Report" (Palo Alto, Calif.: Far West Laboratory, 1967).

was defined as an activity done for its own sake rather than for obtaining reward or avoiding punishment that have no inherent connection with the activity itself.) The objectives of this approach were (1) it was self pacing; (2) it permitted the learner to explore freely; (3) it informed the learner immediately about the consequences of his actions; (4) it permitted the learner to make full use of his capacity for discovering relations of various kinds; and (5) its structure was such that the learner was likely to make a series of interconnected discoveries about the physical, cultural, and social world. The study's findings indicated that the children who remained in the program for two years performed more like middle class children on achievement tests. They also scored significantly higher on the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test than comparable children who had not been in the program.

The writer believes that teacher characteristics are highly relevant to the extent to which disadvantaged children are motivated to learn. Teacher behaviors and attitudes were considered to be significant factors in determining to what extent the child was able to make the learning process a self-rewarding one, and the relationship between the child's learning process and internal and external support for such learning. The United States Office of Education reported as follows:

> ...Project Sears, a report on the impact of compensatory education on some poverty districts in Cali-

> fornia, discovered that the poor attitudes and prejudices displayed by some teachers toward their students hampered student achievement. The teachers did not understand the problems facing their students, and the lack of communication resulted in part, in the failure of the schools to influence the pupils.[31]

In summary, disadvantaged children have a great deal of dependency conflict. For example, they were found to have had difficulty in accepting dependency needs and in permitting themselves to turn to a protective environment for support. Children who regarded peers as friends were able to play and adjust more freely in new environments with greater interest and curiosity. The feeling that ones' successes were determined by the level of his active participation in the learning process and teacher attitudes were evident. Thus, as children developed more confidence in themselves and positive self-images, they were able to relate better to others and perform better in learning situations.

Parent Involvement

Project Head Start has set as one of its major objectives the involvement of parents in the learning process of children. This commitment was the first declared in federal legislation dealing with educational matters.

It is the opinion of the writer that the need for involvement by parents and family members of the disadvantaged child is necessary since progress in school is directly re-

---

[31] Title I, Year II, United States Office of Education, 1968, p. 43.

lated to his connections with the immediate community in which he spends a greater portion of his time. There was very limited research available as to the best ways in which programs can actively be implemented to promote more effective participation of parents as advisors, policy-makers, and employers in educational programs. Among the few who supported this concept were former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Wilber J. Cohen, who wrote:

> ...The time has come to break down these walls of separation. Public agencies have a responsibility to open up the opportunities for participation particularly for poor people and members of minority groups. The need is all the more urgent in today's complex world in huge organizations, impersonality and fragmented and specialized services seem to threaten the individual's sense of significance and self esteem.[32]

The problem of communication between school and home was a persistent one for disadvantaged parents. Johnson and Palomares found that the major difference between parents who participated in Head Start and those who did not, was that participating families knew more about community services, while the non-participating families knew less and utilized them less frequently.[33] Curwood found through parent interviews that some parents were involved as teacher assistants, classroom aides, or room mothers while others worked in neigh-

---

[32]Report prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by a Panel of Authorities on Child Development, Robert Cooke, Chairman, Number 923454 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964).

[33]Henry Johnson and Uvaldo Palomares, "A Study of Some Ecological, Economic and Social Factors Influencing Parental Participation in Project Head Start" (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1965).

borhoods as case aides in most Head Start centers.[34] She reported that these parents consistently expressed pleasure in being involved actively in the program. Harding found Head Start parents enthusiastic about all aspects of the program but indicated that the greatest change came in their children's interest in new things.[35] Sigel and McBane interviewed mothers of Head Start children and found enthusiasm toward the program but also the expectation that children would be obedient and compliant to authority. This expectation occurred more often in Head Start mothers than in middle class mothers.[36] Stern conducted a study to determine (1) whether providing parents with materials and techniques would help them become more effective teachers of their own children; and (2) whether parents who saw themselves as fulfilling a meaningful role in promoting the learning of their children would also demonstrate a marked decrease in feelings of powerlessness and alienation in relation to the larger community.[37]

---

[34]Sarah T. Curwood, "A Survey and Evaluation of Project Head Start as Established and Operated in Communities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts During the Summer of 1965," OEO-551 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965).

[35]John Harding, "A Comparative Study of Various Project Head Start Programs" (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1966).

[36]Irving E. Sigel and Bonnie McBane, "The Relationship Between Cognitive Competence and Level of Symbolization Among Five-Year-Old Children," in J. Hellmuth (ed.), Disadvantaged Child, 1, 1967.

[37]Carolyn Stern, "Comparative Effectiveness of Echoic and Modeling Procedures in Language Instruction with Culturally Disadvantaged Children" (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967).

While there was subjective evidence that the parents were appreciated and welcomed in the program, no statistical differences were found in their children. However, a definite and consistent trend toward decreasing feelings of alienation from society for those parents who participated in the study was evident.

Hayden et al. very recently completed a national survey prepared for Project Head Start which was concerned primarily with the impact of Head Start on educational and health institutions.[38] The study reported that Head Start was highly involved in 56 percent of the institutional changes studied when the level of parent participation was high. Head Start was highly involved in the change process in only 26 percent of the cases when the level of parent participation was low. The survey team concluded that there seems to be a relationship between the degree of parental participation in Head Start programs and the extent of the programs' involvement in the institutional change process.

A highly critical and comprehensive study done by the Legal Defense and Education Division of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,[39] which was de-

---

[38]Robert G. Hayden et al., "A National Survey of the Impact of Head Start on Community Institutions, OEO Contract No. B894638 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970).

[39]Title I ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children, A Report by the Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (Washington, D. C.: Washington Research Project, 1966).

signed to determine whether Title I was fulfilling its intended objectives, found that in most cases poor communities were completely unaware of Title I. For example, of the 191 parents interviewed for this study (including target area community leaders), not one of them was informed about Title I and how it operated. Jordan[40] further found that parental involvement in Title I programs in the state of Massachusetts was minimal; and when found, it was not imaginative. He recommended to the U. S. Office of Education:

> ...that project planners be encouraged to involve parents and community in Title I projects to a much greater degree than presently exists and that proposals be required to specify the nature of involvement on all levels: planning, implementation, and evaluation.

After some successful efforts to involve parents in Project Head Start and some strong recommendations to the effect that the Title I Program itself should include activities and services in which parents may be involved, the U. S. Office of Education suggested that each local school district provide for the maximum practical involvement of parents in the design planning, operation, and evaluations of Title I Programs. A Title I report on a study designed to identify features of a "successful" compensatory education program, listed active parent involvement as one very important factor.[41]

---

[40]Jordan (See footnote 28, this chapter.)

[41]Grotberg (See footnote 24, this chapter.)

Community Involvement

There have been a number of studies and reports recommending citizen participation. While some states questioned the authority of the Office of Education to require citizen involvement, major studies and reports cite the desperate need for this type of participation. Two such studies and reports are the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (known as the Kerner Report)[42] and the Report of President Nixon's Task Force on Education (known as the Pifer Report).[43]

The Kerner Report recommends an expansion of community participation. It states that..."expansion of opportunities for community and parental participation in the school system is essential to the successful functioning of the inner-city school."

The Pifer Report recommended that the administration hold private meetings with minority group leaders to discuss the problems of urban education, with an emphasis placed on listening. Community control of schools was recognized as an issue on which a position might ultimately have to be taken. The Pifer Report also recommended that the new administration give serious consideration to a new Urban Education

---

[42] Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 24.

[43] Report of the President's Task Force on Education (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

Act. It further recommended that cities show evidence of the involvement of community opinion in the preparation of proposals, and that cities would have to assure the administration that only the most disadvantaged areas would be funded.

Official comments in support of community participation have come forth from administrations, past and present. Like the major studies and reports, these official comments remain words in the wilderness. In the previous administration, both Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education, supported the idea of community participation. Cohen released the following statement to the press:

> ...Parents should be members of advisory committees and boards that establish policy on health, education, and welfare programs affecting their children. There should be a strong representation of disadvantaged people on such committees and boards. This principle applies to programs at neighborhood, city, county, state, regional, and national levels.[44]

Harold Howe II issued the following statement entitled "Participation and Partnership":

> ...We must listen to the people we are trying to serve and enlist their support not just as spectators but as active participants in the decision-making process. I believe the future health of our public schools is probably more deeply tied up with this issue than with any other. More Federal, State, and local money will not solve

---

[44]Press Release by Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C., December 2, 1968.

> the problems of the schools unless we are skillful enough to give the people served by the schools an appropriate partnership in devising solutions to these problems.[45]

Recently, one of the strongest official statements on the subject of community participation was made by James E. Allen, Jr., formerly Assistant Secretary of HEW and U. S. Commissioner of Education. He asserted that:

> ...In seeking to achieve a genuine and viable partnership with the community a most important step is that of erasing any suggestion of we, the observers and planners, and they, the observed and unrepresented. Mere token participation will not suffice.
>
> Creative planning for urban education must include representatives of political, social, and economic groups -- and most importantly -- the residents of the inner-city to be served.
>
> Our hope is to find ways for all groups within society to become active participants in the educational process. We must encourage, at all levels, closer working relationships among the educational community and business, political, and social forces.
>
> Let me underscore the need for, and the urgency with which, this Office must prepare for a true partnership with local community participants. These participants must be given their full right to exercise their options. This has not been the case for too long in too many places.
>
> For example, in too many States, ESEA, Title I funds for the disadvantaged have not filtered through the system to the intended beneficiaries and poor Blacks have asked, "What has that money done for us?" Now they are asking "How do we gain control of what is rightfully ours?" It is

---

[45]Statement by Harold Howe II, U. S. Commissioner of Education, Issued in Washington, D. C., November 18, 1968.

> our job to make sure they do share control of these funds. Overly centralized systems of educational control can no longer respond adequately to the diverse needs of local residents. Federal and State legislation must find ways to establish decision-making on a true partnership with the residents of the communities which are the targets of our assistance.[46]

In summary, a communication gap exists between the school and parents and community residents. A genuine willingness on the part of the educational institutions is essentail if meaningful participation is going to occur. This means that if programs for disadvantaged children are going to be successful, they must be part of an alliance between parents, community residents, and educators. Indications were evident that parents want to be involved in the educational programs for their children. They must, if the school is to succeed in its efforts to extend compensatory education programs.

Follow-up Studies

An important question asked about Head Start was: If the program was properly implemented and follow-up steps were taken by the receiving schools, would there be a lasting effect on the participating children? While the evidence was quite consistent concerning the short-range impact of Head Start, evidence was contradictory concerning long-range im-

---

[46] Address by James E. Allen, Jr., before Annual Medalist Dinner of the New York Academy of Public Education, Biltmore Hotel, New York, New York, May 20, 1969.

pact. When Head Start children entered public schools with no consideration given to follow-up, Cline and Dickey found no significant differences from children who had no Head Start experience at the end of the kindergarten year.[47] On the other hand, Beller found that children who had a preschool experience scored higher at the end of first grade than children who had no preschool or kindergarten experience.[48] He further found that children who had preschool experiences, whether nursery or kindergarten, received higher grades in second grade in arithmetic, reading, and writing than children who entered first grade with no prior experience.

The study by Sigel et al. suggested a latent effect of Head Start when it reported that Head Start children did not differ significantly from non-Head Start children at the beginning of kindergarten;[49] however, at the end of kindergarten, they scored higher than the control group. Sigel suggested that the children's exposure to Head Start experiences enable them to assimilate new information in kindergarten. Hubbard also found greater gains at the end of

---

[47]Marvin G. Cline and Marguerite Dickey, "An Evaluation and Follow-Up Study of Summer 1966 Head Start Children in Washington, D. C." (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

[48]Beller (See footnote 9, this chapter).

[49]Irving E. Sigel, et al., "The Relationship Between Cognitive Competence and Level of Symbolization Among Five-Year-Old Children" (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966).

second grade than at the end of first grade.[50] This was more evident in the area of oral language than in other areas of learning.

A number of studies have been a part of special programs and demonstrations. Earlier mention was made of Deutsch's study involving young disadvantaged children at the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York.[51] In a similar study on a five-year demonstration project called The Early Training Project (also referred to as the DARCEE Project), Gray followed a group of children from disadvantaged backgrounds from age three through eight years to determine the effects of the Early Training Project after children entered public school.[52] The findings clearly substantiated a positive effect of the project at the end of the second year of public schooling. Reading readiness scores favored the experimental group. They also scored consistently higher on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test and the WISC Tests.

Before the Title I program was implemented in rural Eastern Kentucky, a research team under the direction of Kincheloe from the University of Kentucky reported that the school districts made no effort to go outside their districts to recruit teachers and administrators; there were no job

---

[50]James Hubbard, "An Exploratory Study of Oral Language Development Among Culturally Different Children" (Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse, 1967).

[51]Deutsch (See footnote 7, Chapter I).

[52]Susan Gray, "The DARCEE Early Training Project" (Nashville: George Peabody College, 1967).

descriptions for school personnel; there were no means for accounting for school expenditures; nor was there evaluation designed for pupils or staff.[53] In 1967, the team returned to the same districts and found that after receiving Title I funds, the communities had made an effort to define responsibilities by developing job descriptions for personnel; communication had significantly improved; data on staff and pupils were available to indicate that some form of evaluation occurred; and some evidence of outside competent personnel were employed to meet the specific requirements for certain positions. The team concluded that Title I has caused many changes and unquestionably has the potential for producing further changes in these school districts.

Foley, in a study conducted at the University of Iowa, found that the aspirations of Title I children were lower; and their expectations, achievements, and attendance were lower in comparison with the state wide sample.[54] On the encouraging side, Iowa Title I programs had the most complete data on pupils and personnel. There was a changing trend in assignments, administrators were younger and more imaginative,

---

[53]James B. Kincheloe, The Impact of Title I upon the Administrative Operations of Four Rural Economically Depressed, and Culturally Deprived School Districts, University of Iowa, U. S. Office of Education Contract No. 600127-0946 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

[54]Walter J. Foley, "Pupil, Staff, and Educational Facility Characteristics, Associated with Public Law 89-10 Title I Projects in Iowa," University of Iowa, U. S. Office of Education Contract No. 3-6-001043 1514 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

and teachers had less training and more experiences. Follow-up studies will be made in the future to determine program adjustment and to note pupil progress after a complete analysis has been made of data, collected on both pupils and personnel.

Levan from Arizona State University studied changes in the attitudes of educators toward disadvantaged children in fifty selected Title I programs.[55] An experimental group who took inservice training courses and a control group from the same school who did not take inservice training were tested for comparison. Teachers participating in the courses changed favorably toward disadvantaged children, while those without the training maintained many of their unfavorable attitudes toward disadvantaged children. Administrators had the greatest degree of favorable attitude change.

Mosback et al. did a study for the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (referred to as the Tempo Study)[56] in which they measured the effects of compensatory education by comparing achievement test scores in a specific grade and school for one year with those for children in the same grade and school the following year in eleven school

---

[55]Frederick D. Levan, Training Teachers To Teach The Disadvantaged: A Study of Attitude Change, University of Arizona, U. S. Office of Education Contract (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

[56]Edward J. Mosback et al., Analyses of Compensatory Education in Five School Districts, Tempo, General Electric Company, U. S. Office of Education Contract No. OEO-0-8-080462-3513(010) (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

districts. The data did not indicate significant changes in pupils' achievement over a one-year period. The research team suggested to HEW that careful attention should be given to longitudinal studies to start explicit analysis to measure the progress of individual children during exposure to compensatory education programs. It was suggested that such analysis should last for several years and include more data than just achievement scores.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been concerned from the very beginning of Project Head Start with the impact of Head Start on community agencies. A study previously mentioned, done by the Kirschner Associates, Inc. for Project Head Start (completed in May, 1970), was the first large study done on this subject.[57] There were some positive findings concerning the significance of the changes in the educational and health institutions studied. During the brief life span of Head Start, they reported that the project has caused some remarkable changes in these two institutional groups. In the conclusion, it was stated that these institutions were:

> ...concerned with the needs and the problems of the poor and of the minorities, and have manifested this concern by revising curricula, schedule, approaches, services, etc...They have increasingly involved the public, including the poor, in positions of influence, and they have changed employment criteria so that neighborhood people without professional credentials occupy important paraprofessional positions.

---

[57] Hayden (See footnote 38, this chapter.)

> One can truly say that these institutions are still not fully responsive to the poor, that the local commitment to change has not been backed by local dollars and that the available educational and medical technology is not adequate to the needs. But one cannot deny that in a short time, with a relatively small investment, Head Start has been closely associated on a national basis with the development of fundamental changes in educational and health institutions, two of the most crucial institutional groups in the country.

In summary, evidence indicates that whether children maintain their advantage after Head Start experience seems to depend on the length of time, the kind of program, the appropriateness of the learning experiences, and the level of parent and community involvement. There was some indication that the attitudes of staff toward disadvantaged children played a significant role in the learning process.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER II

The need for continued research in areas presented in this chapter was clear. Some of these areas have yielded more findings than others, and some have received more attention. Further, it would be unreasonable to expect immediate definitive answers to problems related to the two relatively new massive social experimental programs, Project Head Start and Title I. The available data appeared to indicate that there was an immediate impact of Head Start and other early childhood education programs; but little was known about factors to which this impact may be ascribed or the circumstances under which both change and final levels of attainment in cognitive and affective areas may be maximized.

Considering the evidence now available, the years from birth through eight years are important in human development, and children of the poor generally have not had the experiences nor the opportunities to support maximum development during this period. Head Start and Title I have focused attention on the needs of preschool and elementary school children from low income families; and through continued review of program effectiveness, local institutions can be stimulated to do a better job of meeting the needs of the disadvantaged child.

Further evidence revealed that disadvantaged children were able to develop in cognitive or intellectual areas, in achievement, and in social behavior as a result of early in-

terventions and special training activities for personnel who were responsible for directing children's learning activities. Teacher's attitudes toward disadvantaged children may be changed positively as a result of working with children. Other teacher characteristics such as being resourceful, flexible, and supportive were important to children's development.

Parents and community residents generally favor Head Start and Title I, and view these programs as valuable for their children. Limited studies were found concerning parent participation and community involvement. Perhaps this was due to a new emphasis in these areas and the difficulty in conducting research in them. It was found that the level of parent participation correlated with the degree of changes made in health and educational programs. Further it was found that parent and community involvement were important areas which warrant continued study.

Follow-up studies of special programs and demonstration projects suggested that Head Start and Title I were successful strategies in that they have widely achieved their goals of modifying local educational institutions so that, to a degree, they were more responsive to the needs and desires of the poor. As a result of the review of various demonstration projects, there seems to be an unprecedented opportunity to explore new approaches toward working with the disadvantaged child and the need to develop a

general foundation of knowledge from more exploratory studies prior to reaching a stage at which well formulated questions for careful and specific research can be formulated.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods and procedures used to bring about the completion of this study. As stated in Chapter I, the descriptive survey method of research utilizing the questionnaire-interview technique was used to collect data for analysis and to produce a general description of the programs involved in the study.

Methods of Gathering Data

A five-page question-guide was designed to collect data for this survey. The instrument went through three preliminary drafts. The first draft was developed after (1) determining the originality of the study by a review of research issues of Documents, ERIC Clearinghouse; Review of Research, 1965 to 1969, a publication by the Office of Economic Opportunity; Encyclopedia of Educational Research; and Dissertation Abstracts; (2) consultation with educational specialists from the Office of Child Development in Washington, D. C. and Dr. Robert G. Hayden, principal staff member for Kirschner Associates, Inc. who had just completed a study[1] for the Office of Economic Opportunity similar to the writers' investigation.

A faculty member from the Center for Educational Research,

---

[1]Hayden (See footnote 38, Chapter II.)

School of Education, University of Massachusetts, as well as a doctoral candidate from the above center were very helpful in criticizing and making suggestions for improving the original question-guide. As a result of some of the advice received, a second draft of the instrument was made. The instrument was then pretested on two consultants to Project Head Start, a curriculum specialist in early childhood education, two directors of Head Start, a director of Title I, two parents of Head Start children, and three teachers--two of whom had taught kindergarten and worked with disadvantaged children. It was also reviewed critically by a research supervisor from the Department of Research, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland and a staff member from the Office of Child Development, Washington, D. C.

Following the pretest, minor revisions were made; and the instrument was presented to the writer's dissertation committee for evaluation. Members of the committee provided invaluable guidance for writing the final revision of the question-guide.

Internal Aspects of the Instrument

The question-guide was designed to accommodate three categories of persons responding; namely, directors of Title I, directors of Head Start, and parents having children who had participated in both programs. The instrument included a number code on the left hand side of the guide for the writer's use in determining the purpose of the question

and to whom each particular question was intended. Some questions were designed for all three categories of persons responding, while others were designed for persons in one and/or two categories. The writer rephrased where necessary during interviews, any question that was intended for persons in more than one category.

The characteristics of the question-guide provided for a three-section classification of questions. The first digit of the code number beside each question was for classification. Questions beginning with the number one were classified as those questions concerned with program changes within the schools as a direct result of Head Start's influence. Questions beginning with the number two represented those dealing with coordination of Head Start and the Title I Program with reference to collecting and disseminating information, cooperative efforts, and means of communication. Questions beginning with the number three were concerned with parent and community participation.

The second, third, and fourth digits represented persons for whom the questions were intended. Directors of Title I were asked to respond to all questions listed on the question-guide since the study was basically designed to ascertain information reflecting changes within the schools. Their code number was the number two found in the third digit. For the Directors of Head Start, the code number was the number one in the second digit; and the number three in the fourth digit was coded for parents. When a question was not intended for

an interviewee, a zero was placed in the digit representing the person.

The following is an example of the coding system used by the writer:

Classification of Question	Director of Head Start	Director of Title I	Parents
2	1	2	3

The Sample

The question-guide as ultimately developed, was used by the writer during interviews for the purpose of having before the interviewee questions in an organized manner and a means of recording data systematically. (See Appendix A for sample question-guide)

Twenty school systems were selected by the writer with assistance from staff members in the Office of Child Development and the United States Office of Education, both located in Washington, D. C. The programs selected included children known to have participated in Project Head Start and enrolled in schools utilizing Title I funds. The sampling was limited to thirteen states and included large and small programs located in rural and urban areas.

Personal interviews were conducted involving sixty persons. The interviews were confined to three individuals from each school district. They included (1) a director of Head Start; (2) a director of Title I program and/or a school official in a school district utilizing Title I funds for children

who were previously enrolled in Project Head Start; and (3) a parent having children who had participated in Head Start.

At the writer's request, the above offices supplied a list of thirty-five school districts of which twenty districts were selected. Only two of the original school districts selected were reluctant about participating in the study. They were dropped in favor of two more cooperative school districts.

Prior to going into each district, the writer (1) telephoned the person listed on the federal program application as being responsible for the project at the local level, to request permission to conduct the personal interviews and to confirm a date in which the writer could come to conduct the interviews.

A follow-up letter confirming each request was mailed immediately after the telephone conversation. (See Appendix B.) The interviews were conducted during the months of May, August, and September, 1970. In seven school districts, the writer spent only one day. In each case, interviewees were assembled in a single location. In five school districts, the writer spent two days each; and in one district, the writer spent two days and had to make a return visit on one additional day to obtain a third interview.

Considering the fact that only two means of communications were used, the 100 percent response was especially gratifying. The excellent cooperation seemed to indicate that

school districts were not only highly interested but also very concerned about these programs in their communities. Many of the interviewees offered additional comments beyond what was requested. These comments are summarized in Chapter V.

Review of the Literature

An extensive review of the literature was made on early childhood education in general and on programs for young disadvantaged children with particular reference to Head Start and Title I studies. Basic reference used to identify studies, reports, textbooks, and articles included the Review of Educational Research; Readers' Guide to Periodic Literature; A Report on Evaluation Studies of Project Head Start; Encyclopedia of Educational Research; Dissertation Abstracts; and card catalogs of various libraries.

The services and facilities of several libraries were used in locating literature for review. The writer wishes to mention that due to the nature of his professional internship at the United States Senate, Washington, D. C., he was fortunate to be able to call upon the services of the Library of Congress located in the same facilities as the Senate Office Building. Having easy access to various sources was extremely helpful to the writer, particularly for obtaining first hand information to include in Chapter II.

From the above facilities, the researchers checked several hundred topics related to early childhood education or

studies on the young disadvantaged child. A large number of these were read, and the most pertinent references to the current investigation were reported in Chapter II. Some references were also used to document certain statements in Chapter I.

In the résumé of the literature, an attempt was made to bring together studies and to express philosophies which point up the major issues involved in the writer's investigation. It was found that there were evidences of an immediate impact of Head Start and other early childhood education programs for the disadvantaged child; but little was known about to what this impact may be ascribed or the circumstances under which both change and final levels of cognitive and affective attainment may be maximized. As a result of the review of various follow-up studies, it was found that Head Start and Title I had, to a degree, caused local educational institutions to modify their goals so that they could better meet the educational needs of the disadvantaged child. Studies clearly pointed to the critical need for the development of a general foundation of knowledge from more exploratory ventures prior to reaching a stage at which well formulated questions for careful and specific research could be formulated.

The basic study for the writer's descriptive survey was clearly defined in an area where there continues to be a rise of programs seeking to make significant differences in the lives of the poor.

Data Treatment

After coding the sixty usable survey instruments, plans were developed for recording the data on IBM punch cards for each question-guide. Arrangements were made with the computer center, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts for key punching and use of the computer. The writer was supplied with: (1) a data processing "straight" run, and (2) a data processing percentage run. With these runs, the writer was able to construct tables needed to make an analysis of the data for this study. However before the tables could be set up directly, it was necessary to do some hand tabulating from the data processing straight run.

Statistical methods were not attempted because the nature of the study does not require such measures to analyze and describe the data extracted from the survey instrument.

Analysis of the Data

The data collected from the survey instrument are contained in tables located in Chapter IV. Analyses were made and findings were presented in Chapter IV to show evidence to support certain statements.

Procedures for Developing the Summary and Conclusions

In writing the summary, the writer briefly reviewed the procedures, findings, and entire involvement of the problem. Since the evidence from the various facets of the problem was presented in Chapter IV, the most important points are merely

integrated in a summary in Chapter V.

C H A P T E R I V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The findings presented in this chapter were based on the data obtained from personal interviews conducted by the writer with the aid of an accompanying question-guide. The framework for developing the analysis of data evolved from the "statement of the problem" which was stated in Chapter I.

Twenty school districts participated in this study. The writer observed two programs in each community; namely, the Head Start Project and the corresponding Title I Project. The names of the school districts were not identified nor described in any way in this study. The participating projects were assured by the writer of this confidentality.

There are some basic facts that should be pointed out from the outset whereby the reader may have a better perspective of the presentation of the data in this study. The writer found that:

1. Persons responding from the projects averaged 3.2 years of experience in their positions. Parents interviewed averaged 2.6 years of involvement in Head Start and/or Title I projects.

2. Head Start Projects served an average of two hundred ninety-five children per project, whereas Title I Projects served an average of eleven hun-

dred eighty-nine children per project.

3. The average staff assigned to each project was as follows:

   a. For Head Start - thirty-four professionals per project and twenty-four paraprofessionals, making a total of fifty-eight employees per project.

   b. For Title I - forty-four professionals per project and thirty paraprofessionals, making a total of seventy-four employees per project. It must be pointed out that the staff for Title I was in addition to regularly assigned local staff. Title I personnel was aimed at supplementing the existing schools program.

4. Head Start projects had an average of nineteen classes, whereas Title I serviced fifty-three classes in each school district.

After reviewing the problem and studying the findings, the reader should gain an understanding of various aspects of the public school program servicing pupils who previously participated in Head Start and determine some basic changes that have taken place due to the operation of Head Start.

PART I

The principle concern in Part I of Chapter IV deals with the changes that have been made in the organizational aspects of twenty public school districts where Title I funds were available to continue additional services to children who had participated in Project Head Start and were currently enrolled in the school districts under investigation.

Data on this focus were elicited from the following questions:

1. How many social workers have been employed?
2. How many community workers have been employed?
3. How many psychologists have been employed?
4. How many volunteer resource agencies have offered their services to the program?
5. About how many program children have free lunch provision?
6. How many non-paid classroom volunteers have been utilized?
7. Have additional health services been made available to program participants?
8. Has a breakfast program been instituted?
9. Has the curriculum been extended to include pupil enrollment at an earlier age?

10. Has the ratio of paraprofessionals to regular professional employees been increased?

11. Has a modified curriculum been rewritten into behavioral terms?

12. Does the modified curriculum include an enrichment phase?

13. Has the instructional program been increased to include new materials?

14. Has the instructional program been increased to include new equipment?

15. How many early childhood specialists have been employed to help teachers in carrying out their instructional program?

The preceding questions were considered by the respective twenty school districts who participated in this study. Those who responded included Title I Project directors, who answered all questions included in this part. In most cases, these same questions were considered by corresponding Head Start directors as well as parents from respective communities. For a complete analysis of responses to these questions with respect to all twenty school districts, refer to the tables at the conclusion of the discussion of Part I of this chapter (pp. 70-78).

The responses to the questions under consideration were obtained from interviewees by the writer himself with an accompanying question-guide. It should be pointed out that data were subjective in that human recall was the means by which most responses were made. It is noteworthy, however, to mention that there were some cases of factual data available on certain questions. For example, the fiscal records were available to obtain information on the number of lunches served, category of personnel, and the number of staff employed. This factual data were found in all projects observed.

The results of the data collected were presented in the manner that follows:

1. To the extent that it was possible, a natural counting number was used to answer the questions seeking "how many."

2. Percentages were used when appropriate. For example, data concerning the free lunch programs were presented in this manner.

3. In cases where dichotomous situations existed, "yes or no" responses were used.

The results were presented by a means-analysis test. A comparison of quantitative responses on Title I and Head Start projects was made where appropriate. Tables were numbered to correspond with the outcome of the results of the following

data obtained from an analysis of the response:

1. Head Start projects were serviced by an average of 1.5 social workers per project, whereas Title I projects were serviced by approximately three social workers per project.

2. Community workers[1] were found to have been employed more often as well as for a longer period of time in Head Start projects. There was an average of 6.5 persons per project. Title I projects employed 6.3 persons.

3. Psychologists were utilized to a greater extent in Title I projects. An average of 2.2 positions were filled in each project. Each Head Start project averaged 1.3 psychologists per project.

4. Volunteer agencies[2] provided more services to Head Start projects. There was an average of seventeen agencies providing services to each Head Start project, while Title I had only nine agencies servicing each Title I project.

5. An average of two hundred ninety-five Head Start

---

[1]Community workers included Health, Social, and Community Aides.

[2]Volunteer agencies included church groups, scouts, civic groups, school groups, etc.

children were provided with free lunches daily. Title I averaged three hundred seventy-six free lunches. It must be kept in mind that Title I projects served far more children than the corresponding Head Start projects. The above figure for Head Start represented 100 percent of the children who participated, while the above Title I figure represented approximately 30 percent of the children served in Title I projects.

6. The number of non-paid classroom volunteers utilized varied considerably according to the role and perception of the person being interviewed. For example, Head Start directors considered the average number of volunteers to be sixty per program. Title I directors perceived the number to be fifty-four per project, while the parents' perception was approximately thirty-one volunteers servicing each project.

7. Parents, Head Start directors, and Title I directors were in agreement with respect to additional health services; that is, 95 percent of the communities reported an increase in health services.

8. There was a free lunch program for parents who for various reasons visited programs in 80 percent of the Head Start projects; whereas only 30 percent

of corresponding Title I projects provided lunches for parents. On the other hand, however, parents rated the free lunch program differently. They considered the availability of free lunches to exist 55 percent of the time, irrespective of the project providing such services.

9. There was a breakfast program for children instituted in 50 percent of the Head Start projects. A breakfast program was found in 40 percent of the Title I projects. Various forms of financial assistance were used by Title I schools to institute their breakfast programs. These programs were mostly pilot in nature and they serviced only a small percentage of the project children.

10-14. Questions 10 through 14 were asked of Title I directors only. There were 100 percent Yes responses to all questions. Some comment on these positive responses follows:

a. The curriculum was extended within all twenty school districts. In eight school systems, pilot Kindergarten programs were put into operation for the first time. In six school districts, the Kindergarten program was expanded to include all children within the school systems. Previously, only Title I children were

included in these districts. There were four pre-kindergarten programs sponsored by Title I projects. Outdoor science curricula were developed in three districts.

15. There were fourteen early childhood specialists employed in eight of the school districts observed. In two school systems, early childhood specialists served the Head Start projects in addition to their Title I assignment.

TABLE 1 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

NUMBER OF SOCIAL WORKERS IN
HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI
1	1	1
2	1	2
3	2	12
4	1	1
5	3	5
6	1	1
7	3	2
8	1	5
9	1	6
10	2	2
11	1	2
12	2	0
13	1	2
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	2	3
18	1	3
19	1	2
20	0	1
Total	27	53
Response	95%	95%
Mean	1.42	2.79

TABLE 2 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

NUMBER OF COMMUNITY WORKERS EMPLOYED
IN HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI
1	2	3
2	6	5
3	7	10
4	3	5
5	29	9
6	6	0
7	7	4
8	7	14
9	5	12
10	6	4
11	4	5
12	5	0
13	6	8
14	3	1
15	2	3
16	2	1
17	12	10
18	7	10
19	8	8
20	3	3
Total	130	115
Response	100%	100%
Mean	6.50	6.39

TABLE 3 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

NUMBER OF PSYCHOLOGISTS UTILIZED
IN HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI
1	1	1
2	0	2
3	0	9
4	1	1
5	2	1
6	1	1
7	2	2
8	1	3
9	1	0
10	1	2
11	1	2
12	0	0
13	1	2
14	1	1
15	1	4
16	1	1
17	2	1
18	1	2
19	2	2
20	0	1
Total	20	39
Response	80%	90%
Mean	1.25	2.17

TABLE 4 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS IN AGENCIES PROVIDING SERVICES TO HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI
1	25	10
2	10	15
3	15	2
4	20	10
5	18	3
6	15	10
7	30	15
8	20	10
9	10	2
10	20	12
11	20	5
12	2	2
13	15	2
14	16	15
15	20	3
16	15	10
17	15	12
18	6	2
19	35	20
20	8	20
Total	335	180
Response	100%	100%
Mean	16.75	9.00

TABLE 5 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

NUMBER OF FREE LUNCHES SERVED IN HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI
1	50	30
2	141	300
3	740	300
4	45	35
5	755	50
6	143	50
7	500	1,200
8	450	1,000
9	200	500
10	250	200
11	200	250
12	200	100
13	350	100
14	105	75
15	360	600
16	100	75
17	400	1,600
18	300	150
19	500	780
20	120	20
Total	5,909	7,415
Response	100%	100%
Mean	295.45	370.75

TABLE 6 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

NUMBER OF NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS UTILIZED IN HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	40	10	15
2	40	35	25
3	50	12	30
4	18	20	15
5	50	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	300	78	50
8	50	200	140
9	20	0	10
10	50	50	10
11	35	36	25
12	50	0	18
13	25	5	15
14	15	33	25
15	20	15	20
16	30	20	25
17	60	40	20
18	20	0	20
19	250	200	63
20	25	0	0
Total	1,148	753	526
Response	95%	70%	85%
Mean	60.42	53.78	30.94

TABLE 7 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES PROVIDED WITH INCREASED HEALTH SERVICES

Project	HS	TI	P
1	YES	YES	YES
2	YES	YES	YES
3	YES	YES	YES
4	YES	YES	YES
5	YES	YES	YES
6	YES	YES	YES
7	YES	YES	YES
8	YES	YES	YES
9	YES	NO	YES
10	YES	YES	YES
11	YES	YES	YES
12	YES	YES	YES
13	YES	YES	YES
14	YES	YES	YES
15	YES	YES	YES
16	YES	YES	YES
17	YES	YES	YES
18	YES	YES	YES
19	YES	YES	YES
20	NO	YES	YES
Per Cent Yes	95	95	100
No	5	5	0

TABLE 8 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

PERCENTAGE OF FREE LUNCH PROGRAMS FOR PARENTS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	YES	YES	YES
2	YES	NO	YES
3	YES	NO	YES
4	YES	YES	YES
5	YES	NO	YES
6	NO	NO	NO
7	YES	YES	YES
8	YES	NO	NO
9	NO	NO	NO
10	NO	NO	NO
11	YES	NO	YES
12	YES	NO	YES
13	YES	NO	NO
14	YES	NO	NO
15	YES	YES	YES
16	YES	YES	YES
17	YES	YES	YES
18	YES	NO	NO
19	NO	NO	NO
20	YES	NO	NO
Per Cent Yes	80	30	55
No	20	70	45

TABLE 9 ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

NUMBER OF BREAKFAST PROGRAMS INSTITUTED

Project	HS	TI	P
1	NO	NO	NO
2	YES	YES	YES
3	YES	YES	YES
4	NO	NO	NO
5	NO	NO	NO
6	NO	NO	NO
7	YES	YES	YES
8	NO	YES	YES
9	NO	NO	NO
10	NO	YES	NO
11	YES	YES	YES
12	NO	NO	NO
13	YES	NO	YES
14	YES	NO	NO
15	YES	YES	YES
16	YES	NO	NO
17	YES	YES	YES
18	YES	NO	YES
19	NO	NO	NO
20	NO	NO	NO
Per Cent Yes	50	40	45
No	50	60	55

PART II

The major emphasis in Part II of this chapter deals with the working relationship between Head Start staffs and appropriate Title I school personnel receiving Head Start pupils. The data collected herein was analyzed in a manner similar to those data treated in the preceding part. The questions under consideration differ, however.

This portion of Chapter IV concerns itself with data elicited from the following questions:

1. How many visitations between programs have been scheduled on a regular basis throughout the school year?

2. How many times have directors been invited to the public schools' administrative staff meetings on a regular basis?

3. About how many joint conferences concerning children moving from Head Start to regular school programs were held during the past year?

4. About how many times during the past school year were joint meetings between programs held?

5. About how many parents are included in joint conferences concerning children moving from Head Start to the regular school programs?

6. How many credited courses have been made available

for participants from both programs?

7. Do Head Start personnel use the same forms as the regular school personnel to record initial data?

8. Is demographic information obtained for program participants by methods other than a standard inter-agency form?

9. Is there an inter-program schedule for transmitting data concerning children entering public school?

10. Are there administrative procedures in operation which facilitate systematic communication from one program to another?

11. Is data filed where it is easily accessible to staff members?

12. Do you conduct joint in-service training programs?

13. Has the governing board developed a policy statement pledging cooperation between the two programs?

Data concerning each question listed above may be found in the tables that follow the treatment of individual questions (pp. 85-97). In the next few statements, questions will be considered on an individual basis. Among the outcomes of the questions, were the following results:

1. Upon examining the number of scheduled visitations

between projects on a regular basis throughout the school year, it was found that on the average:

a. Thirty-three visits were made by Head Start staff to Title I projects.

b. Fifteen visits were made by Title I staff to Head Start projects.

2. Upon examining the number of times that directors had been invited to the public school administrative staff meetings on a regular basis, it was found that on the average both the Head Start and Title I directors had been invited the same number of times, namely, seven times each.

3. There was parallelism in the results of the preceding question and the number of joint conferences concerning children moving from Head Start to regular school programs during the 1969-1970 school year. The number was identical, namely, approximately seven each.

4. Upon investigating the number of times that joint meetings between projects were held during the last school year, it was found that on the average, five were initiated by Head Start and four by Title I.

5. There was an average of thirteen parents from Head Start and eleven parents from Title I involved in

joint conferences with school officials concerning children moving from the Head Start program to the regular school program in each community.

6. The results concerning the number of credit courses made available to participants from both programs indicated some variation in the responses, as listed below:

   a. Head Start directors reported four credit courses per year.

   b. Title I directors suggested five credit courses.

   c. Parents perceived only three courses being offered.

7. The results of the twenty school districts visited indicated that 65 percent of the Head Start personnel used the same forms as the regular school personnel to record initial demographic data. At the same time, 75 percent of the Title I personnel used the same forms as the regular school personnel to record demographic data.

8. An outcome of this investigation was the fact that the principle with respect to the method of securing information about program participants in both the Head Start and Title I projects was similar. An average of 85 percent of the projects visited se-

cured additional demographic data on program participants by methods other than the standard form. Most of them obtained information through personal interviews.

9. Head Start and Title I projects under consideration had an inter-program schedule for transmitting data on children entering public schools in 85 percent of the communities observed.

10. Administrative procedures to facilitate systematic communication from one program to another were in operation in 80 percent of all Head Start projects; and 85 percent of the Title I projects had developed such procedures in one form or another.

11. On the basis of this investigation, one must conclude that data was filed such that staff members of both projects could have easy access to it. Of the projects visited, 90 percent of the Head Start directors and 95 percent of the Title I directors asserted that such was the case.

12. It was found that Head Start and corresponding Title I projects in each community conducted joint in-service training programs at least once each school year in 80 percent of the school districts visited.

13. It was revealed that 95 percent of the Head Start projects and 85 percent of the school systems have adopted policy statements by their respective governing boards that pledges cooperation between the two programs.

TABLE 10 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF INTER-PROJECT VISITATIONS MADE BY HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS

Project	HS	TI
1	10	15
2	5	14
3	50	10
4	90	12
5	16	16
6	200	1
7	60	48
8	30	40
9	0	0
10	15	15
11	15	10
12	0	0
13	1	1
14	10	8
15	20	20
16	10	8
17	18	16
18	1	1
19	10	20
20	0	0
Total	561	255
Response	85%	85%
Mean	33.00	15.00

TABLE 11 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF TIMES HEAD START AND TITLE I DIRECTORS WERE INVITED TO REGULAR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF MEETINGS

Project	HS	TI
1	10	10
2	5	5
3	5	9
4	10	10
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	18	27
8	8	7
9	0	0
10	8	4
11	6	6
12	0	0
13	1	2
14	6	5
15	2	2
16	6	5
17	10	10
18	2	2
19	12	10
20	0	0
Total	109	114
Response	75%	75%
Mean	7.26	7.60

TABLE 12 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF JOINT CONFERENCES BETWEEN HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS CONCERNING CHILDREN

Project	HS	TI
1	3	2
2	4	7
3	15	5
4	3	3
5	1	0
6	3	9
7	20	18
8	13	30
9	0	0
10	13	10
11	5	7
12	0	0
13	3	4
14	4	5
15	13	10
16	5	3
17	13	10
18	2	5
19	10	10
20	0	0
Total	130	128
Response	85%	80%
Mean	7.64	7.52

TABLE 13 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF JOINT MEETINGS BETWEEN HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI
1	3	3
2	10	3
3	0	0
4	3	3
5	0	0
6	1	1
7	15	10
8	6	5
9	0	0
10	2	3
11	10	5
12	0	0
13	1	1
14	3	4
15	6	6
16	3	3
17	10	10
18	1	1
19	6	5
20	0	0
Total	80	62
Response	75%	75%
Mean	5.33	4.13

TABLE 14 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF PARENTS ATTENDING CONFERENCES CONCERNING CHILDREN MOVING FROM HEAD START TO THE REGULAR SCHOOL

Project	HS	TI
1	10	10
2	10	7
3	15	20
4	7	10
5	0	0
6	2	3
7	25	25
8	25	15
9	0	0
10	6	5
11	10	5
12	0	0
13	0	0
14	5	4
15	35	25
16	4	3
17	20	10
18	0	0
19	10	16
20	0	0
Total	184	158
Response	70%	70%
Mean	13.14	11.28

TABLE 15 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF COLLEGE CREDITED COURSES
AVAILABLE FOR HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	2	1	1
2	5	5	1
3	5	5	0
4	1	1	0
5	3	3	0
6	2	2	0
7	9	11	11
8	6	8	0
9	0	0	0
10	6	6	2
11	5	6	2
12	0	0	0
13	2	2	0
14	5	5	1
15	4	4	3
16	5	5	3
17	7	7	5
18	2	2	0
19	5	5	1
20	0	0	0
Total	74	78	30
Response	.85%	85%	50%
Mean	4.35	4.58	3.0

TABLE 16 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS USING THE SAME FORMS TO RECORD DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON PARTICIPANTS

Project	HS	TI
1	YES	YES
2	YES	YES
3	YES	YES
4	YES	YES
5	NO	NO
6	YES	YES
7	YES	YES
8	YES	YES
9	NO	NO
10	NO	NO
11	YES	YES
12	NO	NO
13	YES	YES
14	NO	YES
15	YES	YES
16	NO	YES
17	YES	YES
18	YES	YES
19	YES	YES
20	NO	NO
Per Cent Yes	70	75
No	30	25

TABLE 17 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS THAT USED OTHER MEANS OF COLLECTING DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Project	HS	TI
1	YES	YES
2	YES	YES
3	YES	YES
4	YES	YES
5	YES	NO
6	YES	YES
7	YES	YES
8	YES	NO
9	YES	YES
10	YES	YES
11	YES	YES
12	YES	YES
13	YES	YES
14	NO	YES
15	YES	YES
16	NO	YES
17	YES	YES
18	YES	YES
19	YES	YES
20	NO	NO
Per Cent Yes	85	85
No	15	15

TABLE 18 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF PROJECTS WITH A SCHEDULE FOR TRANSMITTING DATA ON CHILDREN

Project	HS	TI
1	YES	YES
2	YES	YES
3	YES	YES
4	YES	YES
5	NO	NO
6	YES	YES
7	YES	YES
8	YES	YES
9	YES	YES
10	YES	YES
11	YES	YES
12	NO	NO
13	YES	YES
14	YES	YES
15	YES	YES
16	YES	YES
17	YES	YES
18	YES	YES
19	YES	YES
20	NO	NO
Per Cent Yes	85	85
No	15	15

TABLE 19 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF PROJECTS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES TO FACILITATE SYSTEMATIC COMMUNICATION

Project	HS	TI
1	YES	YES
2	YES	YES
3	NO	YES
4	YES	YES
5	NO	NO
6	YES	YES
7	YES	YES
8	YES	YES
9	YES	YES
10	YES	YES
11	YES	YES
12	NO	NO
13	YES	YES
14	YES	YES
15	YES	YES
16	YES	YES
17	YES	YES
18	YES	YES
19	YES	YES
20	NO	NO
Per Cent Yes	85	85
No	15	15

TABLE 20 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS THAT FILED DATA
SUCH THAT STAFFS FROM BOTH PROJECTS HAVE EASY ACCESS TO IT

Project	HS	TI
1	YES	YES
2	YES	YES
3	YES	YES
4	YES	YES
5	YES	NO
6	NO	YES
7	YES	YES
8	YES	YES
9	YES	YES
10	YES	YES
11	YES	YES
12	YES	YES
13	YES	YES
14	YES	YES
15	YES	YES
16	YES	YES
17	YES	YES
18	YES	YES
19	YES	YES
20	NO	YES
Per Cent Yes	90	95
No	10	5

TABLE 21 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF PROJECTS INVOLVED
IN JOINT IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS

Project	HS	TI
1	YES	YES
2	YES	YES
3	NO	NO
4	YES	YES
5	YES	NO
6	YES	YES
7	YES	YES
8	YES	YES
9	NO	YES
10	YES	YES
11	YES	YES
12	NO	NO
13	YES	YES
14	YES	YES
15	YES	YES
16	YES	YES
17	YES	YES
18	YES	YES
19	YES	YES
20	NO	NO
Per Cent Yes	80	80
No	20	20

TABLE 22 WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATING AGENCIES THAT HAVE ADOPTED POLICY STATEMENTS PLEDGING INTER-PROJECT COOPERATION

Project	HS	TI
1	YES	YES
2	YES	YES
3	YES	YES
4	YES	YES
5	NO	NO
6	YES	YES
7	YES	YES
8	YES	YES
9	YES	YES
10	YES	YES
11	YES	YES
12	YES	NO
13	YES	YES
14	YES	YES
15	YES	YES
16	YES	YES
17	YES	YES
18	YES	YES
19	YES	YES
20	YES	NO
Per Cent Yes	95	85
No	5	15

PART III

The primary focus of Part III concerns the extent of parent involvement in the regular school program as a continuation of Head Start's involvement. This focus was consistent with the fundamental premise of both Head Start and Title I Programs. Hayden has stated: "One can truly say that these institutions are still not fully responsive to the poor, that the local commitment to change has not been backed by local dollars."[1]

For this part of Chapter IV, data were elicited from the following questions:

1. In your opinion, what percent of families serviced by the program are received favorably by related community agencies?

2. How many parents observe in the classroom on an unscheduled basis?

3. What percent of parents are members of the Policy Advisory Board?

4. How many parents of children in the program are serving in classrooms as volunteers?

5. How many parents are involved in the preparation of the proposal?

---

[1] Hayden (See Footnote 38, Chapter II.)

6. How many parents are involved in the selection of staff members?

7. About how many home visits are made during a school year?

8. How often do school personnel attend activities in the school's community which are not initiated by the school?

9. About how often are parents invited to your school (P. T. A. meetings excluded)?

10. How many parents of children in the program are employed by your agency?

11. What percent of staff time is spent informing parents in the program about community services?

12. How many parents of children in the program hold office on the Policy Advisory Board?

13. Since the inception of Head Start, has parent involvement increased?

14. Does the Policy Advisory Board approve the proposal before it is submitted for funding?

The preceding questions were investigated via personal interviews that were supplemented with a question-guide instrument. For study of completed data for all responses con-

cerned with this part, refer to the tables on pp. 105-118 following a discussion of each question which follows:

1. Interviewees generally agreed on how other related agencies in respective communities received families serviced by both projects. Head Start directors reported families' being received favorably 62 percent of the time. Title I directors reported 52 percent, and parents reported 56 percent of families' being received favorably by community agencies.

2. Head Start parents observed classes more often on an unscheduled basis. They averaged approximately ninety visits per program per year, while Title I observed one hundred fifty-five times per school year. It must be kept in mind that each Title I school had far more classes in which parents observed than corresponding Head Start projects. Parents reported one hundred twenty-five visits per year. Their perception included visitations in both programs in each community.

3. On the average, each Head Start Policy Advisory Board had 65 percent of its members who were parents of children in the project. Title I included 54 percent of parent representatives serving on each board. Parents agreed that they were included as members of Policy Advisory Boards, and they perceived that they

themselves constituted an average of 61 percent of the membership on each board. It should be pointed out that all Head Start projects had such boards as required by national policy. Title I has not, as of this date, released a national policy which requires a board and parent membership. It is encouraging to report, however, that 80 percent of Title I projects observed had Policy Advisory Boards in operation.

4. Parents of children were found serving as non-paid classroom volunteers in each Head Start project. There was an average of twenty parent volunteers. Title I averaged thirty classroom volunteers per school district. Again it should be pointed out that Title I projects served far more families than did Head Start projects in corresponding communities. Parents perceived an average of thirty-six parent volunteers serving in both programs in each school district.

5. An average of twelve parents from Head Start and ten parents from Title I were involved in the preparation of the proposal for refunding in each community under study, according to respective directors. Parents reported a total of fourteen parents participating in both projects in each school district.

6. Head Start directors revealed that parents were involved in the selection of the director and other staff members in 95 percent of the Head Start projects observed, with an average of seven parents involved in the selection process in each program. Title I parents were involved in 70 percent of the projects observed. There was an average of six parents in the selection process in those Title I projects which permitted involvement, and the involvement was not as extensive as in Head Start. On the average, parents perceived that six representatives from the parent group participated in the selection process.

7. There was an average of four hundred ninety-two home visits made by Head Start staff in each Head Start project. (The average enrollment of a Head Start project as reported earlier was two hundred ninety-five children.) An average of six hundred seventy-five home visits were made by Title I staff. (The average number of children served in each Title I project was eleven hundred eighty-nine). Parents reported that approximately five hundred and four home visits were made in each respective school district by both staffs.

8. Staff from each Head Start project attended an

Parents in each district perceived that they were holding approximately four positions in the combined projects in each community.

13. There was uniform agreement concerning the increase in parent involvement. All persons responding in each project indicated that since the inception of Head Start, there has been a continuous increase in parent involvement within both projects.

14. The Policy Advisory Boards in all Head Start projects considered in this study approved the proposal before it was submitted for funding, whereas 80 percent of the Title I projects were approved by the Policy Advisory Boards before submission.

TABLE 23 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES RECEIVED FAVORABLY BY OTHER AGENCIES

Project	HS	TI	P
1	50	40	30
2	75	50	50
3	80	75	38
4	43	40	25
5	50	50	50
6	75	75	60
7	75	75	80
8	75	50	75
9	50	60	60
10	75	60	75
11	75	75	75
12	20	25	25
13	50	50	50
14	38	25	50
15	100	80	75
16	30	25	50
17	50	75	50
18	100	38	38
19	80	50	75
20	50	50	25
Total Response	1,241 100%	1,068 100%	1,128 100%
Mean	62.05	53.40	56.40

TABLE 24 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF TIMES PARENTS OBSERVED ON AN UNSCHEDULED BASIS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	20	30	25
2	45	150	150
3	25	50	75
4	23	30	30
5	200	0	300
6	18	0	15
7	250	650	450
8	100	250	300
9	50	0	50
10	100	75	75
11	50	125	100
12	75	0	100
13	100	40	50
14	60	40	38
15	100	200	360
16	50	40	30
17	200	500	150
18	95	50	75
19	200	100	100
20	25	0	20
Total	1,786	2,330	2,493
Response	100%	75%	100%
Mean	89.30	155.33	124.65

TABLE 25 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS ON POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	75	50	50
2	50	60	75
3	75	50	85
4	75	50	80
5	60	0	50
6	60	0	50
7	70	75	65
8	70	60	50
9	75	60	50
10	60	50	50
11	50	50	50
12	70	0	90
13	90	50	50
14	70	50	80
15	55	50	50
16	70	50	75
17	80	50	75
18	25	11	20
19	60	50	75
20	50	0	50
Total	1,290	816	1,220
Response	100%	80%	100%
Mean	64.50	54.12	61.00

TABLE 26 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS SERVING IN EACH PROJECT

Project	HS	TI	P
1	10	5	0
2	20	35	38
3	10	5	50
4	10	3	10
5	25	0	25
6	10	0	0
7	75	100	150
8	25	38	37
9	20	0	25
10	20	15	10
11	20	35	30
12	24	0	60
13	25	10	20
14	11	25	20
15	25	0	25
16	10	20	20
17	6	100	100
18	10	2	4
19	40	25	25
20	10	0	6
Total	406	418	655
Response	100%	70%	90%
Mean	20.30	29.85	36.38

TABLE 27 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN PROPOSAL PREPARATION

Project	HS	TI	P
1	25	5	50
2	4	6	15
3	30	15	10
4	20	25	40
5	4	0	0
6	2	0	0
7	8	15	10
8	10	10	6
9	10	10	10
10	10	12	5
11	5	6	12
12	10	0	10
13	10	5	5
14	5	10	10
15	15	20	25
16	5	8	5
17	10	6	10
18	5	0	2
19	10	10	10
20	5	0	0
Total	248	163	235
Response	100%	75%	85%
Mean	12.40	10.86	13.82

TABLE 28 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED
IN THE STAFF SELECTION PROCESS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	3	2	3
2	4	2	0
3	3	0	15
4	3	1	3
5	0	0	6
6	0	0	0
7	12	3	2
8	5	7	5
9	10	0	10
10	5	15	5
11	4	3	0
12	10	0	7
13	5	1	1
14	6	10	10
15	15	20	10
16	6	10	10
17	6	1	3
18	5	0	2
19	11	6	0
20	5	5	0
Total	118	86	92
Response	90%	70%	75%
Mean	6.55	6.14	6.13

TABLE 29 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF HOME VISITS MADE
BY HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	150	75	100
2	700	2,000	500
3	50	1,500	300
4	100	80	90
5	700	50	1,200
6	386	28	140
7	1,000	2,500	3,500
8	700	3,000	600
9	400	30	200
10	500	45	200
11	1,000	900	500
12	400	20	100
13	400	100	200
14	210	200	300
15	200	200	200
16	150	200	100
17	1,000	2,000	1,000
18	500	50	200
19	1,200	500	600
20	100	25	50
Total	9,846	13,503	10,080
Response	100%	100%	100%
Mean	492.30	675.15	504.00

TABLE 30 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF NON-SCHOOL INITIATED ACTIVITIES
IN WHICH HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS WERE INVOLVED

Project	HS	TI	P
1	15	25	5
2	10	8	7
3	25	15	12
4	13	25	5
5	32	13	6
6	8	10	4
7	15	30	10
8	8	7	10
9	25	36	20
10	25	26	36
11	10	10	7
12	18	8	20
13	10	10	8
14	18	7	4
15	25	36	10
16	18	6	5
17	38	25	15
18	15	5	7
19	52	5	48
20	15	12	10
Total Response	395	318	249
	100%	100%	100%
Mean	19.75	15.5	12.45

TABLE 31 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF INVITATIONS EXTENDED TO PARENT GROUPS BY HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	18	13	20
2	15	18	10
3	4	12	83
4	18	13	18
5	9	8	2
6	20	0	0
7	10	44	18
8	54	84	12
9	10	4	36
10	15	25	18
11	15	15	10
12	18	0	25
13	20	5	6
14	7	5	10
15	20	12	10
16	7	10	10
17	18	12	12
18	20	3	6
19	26	5	32
20	24	8	2
Total	348	296	340
Response	100%	90%	95%
Mean	17.40	16.44	17.89

TABLE 32 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF PARENTS EMPLOYED BY
HEAD START AND TITLE I PROJECTS

Project	HS	TI
1	2	2
2	8	10
3	40	20
4	2	3
5	20	0
6	7	0
7	16	13
8	17	24
9	6	3
10	7	10
11	10	10
12	20	0
13	8	5
14	4	2
15	15	13
16	3	3
17	13	25
18	9	4
19	11	10
20	4	4
Total	224	157
Response	100%	80%
Mean	11.20	9.81

TABLE 33 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

PERCENTAGE OF TIME HEAD START AND TITLE I STAFFS SPENT INFORMING PARENTS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

Project	HS	TI	P
1	25	20	15
2	10	5	10
3	10	10	10
4	20	10	25
5	15	2	5
6	10	5	5
7	15	10	18
8	5	5	20
9	5	5	9
10	15	10	15
11	10	5	10
12	20	0	10
13	10	5	5
14	13	5	5
15	15	10	10
16	10	5	5
17	10	2	10
18	10	5	5
19	5	2	10
20	5	1	10
Total	228	122	215
Response	100%	95%	100%
Mean	11.40	6.30	10.8

TABLE 34 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NUMBER OF PARENTS SERVING AS
OFFICERS ON POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS

Project	HS	TI	P
1	3	3	3
2	4	2	5
3	3	0	10
4	3	2	3
5	5	0	3
6	3	0	2
7	14	3	4
8	4	3	4
9	3	6	5
10	6	3	5
11	4	3	5
12	6	0	6
13	5	3	3
14	6	3	6
15	4	3	4
16	5	3	5
17	5	4	6
18	5	2	3
19	6	4	2
20	4	0	2
Total	98	47	86
Response	100%	75%	100%
Mean	4.9	2.3	4.3

TABLE 35 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS WITH INCREASED PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Project	HS	TI	P
1	YES	YES	YES
2	YES	YES	YES
3	YES	YES	YES
4	YES	YES	YES
5	YES	YES	YES
6	YES	YES	YES
7	YES	YES	YES
8	YES	YES	YES
9	YES	YES	YES
10	YES	YES	YES
11	YES	YES	YES
12	YES	YES	YES
13	YES	YES	YES
14	YES	YES	YES
15	YES	YES	YES
16	YES	YES	YES
17	YES	YES	YES
18	YES	YES	YES
19	YES	YES	YES
20	YES	YES	YES
Per Cent Yes	100	100	100
No	0	0	0

TABLE 36 PARENT INVOLVEMENT

PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS APPROVING PROPOSALS
BEFORE SUBMISSION FOR REFUNDING

Project	HS	TI	P
1	YES	YES	YES
2	YES	YES	YES
3	YES	YES	YES
4	YES	YES	YES
5	YES	NO	YES
6	YES	NO	YES
7	YES	YES	YES
8	YES	YES	YES
9	YES	YES	YES
10	YES	YES	YES
11	YES	YES	YES
12	YES	NO	YES
13	YES	YES	YES
14	YES	YES	YES
15	YES	YES	YES
16	YES	YES	YES
17	YES	YES	YES
18	YES	YES	YES
19	YES	YES	YES
20	YES	NO	YES
Per Cent Yes	100	80	100
No	0	20	0

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV

This chapter dealt with three classifications of questions to determine: (1) organizational changes taking place within the public schools as a direct result of Head Start's involvement; (2) the working relationship between Head Start and Title I staffs; and (3) the extent of parent involvement as a continuation from Head Start involvement. These findings may be summarized as follows:

1. Additional school personnel were assigned to work not only with the daily program in school but also within the communities where children lived in an attempt to bridge the gap between school and home.

2. The services of volunteer agencies, community groups, and parents as classroom volunteers were utilized to a great extent in the projects observed.

3. There was increased emphasis in the nutrition program as part of the projects observed.

4. More attention was given to health services for disadvantaged children in all projects under study.

5. School districts expanded their curriculums to include children at a younger age. Further, they modified the instructional program to a degree in all districts involved in this investigation.

6. More early childhood education specialists were employed, revealing a genuine concern for early learning.

7. Directors of Head Start and Title I projects were, to a large degree, included in regular administrative meetings.

8. Head Start and Title I staffs cooperated in the following activities:

   a. Conferences concerning children

   b. Classroom visitations between programs

   c. College courses planned in the same interest areas

   d. In-service training planned jointly

   e. Sharing data on children

9. Parent involvement in both projects had increased continually since 1965.

10. Parents participated in the educational process as observers and volunteers.

11. An increasing number of Policy Advisory Committees were organized to include parents as active members, office holders, and participants.

12. Staffs from both programs were active in community activities not initiated by the school.

13. Staffs from both projects spent time disseminating information about community resources available to families.

14. Parents, to a degree, participated in project development and staff selections.

15. Parents were employed by the projects to assist in implementing the instructional program.

C H A P T E R V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem of the Study Restated

The findings in this study centered around five questions which, in effect, formed the basis for obtaining data from the twenty school districts to determine what changes have evolved due to the operation of Head Start. The questions are as follows:

1. Are there organizational changes taking place within public schools as a direct result of Head Start?

2. What is the working relationship between Head Start and Title I staffs in schools receiving pupils who have participated in Head Start?

3. Are activities initiated by Head Start continued with resources available from Title I?

4. Is there an extention of parent involvement in the regular school program as a result of Head Start's involvement?

5. What recommendations might be useful to federal, state, and local officials and other professional personnel who are responsible for administering or improving programs for young disadvantaged children?

Methods and Procedures Used

The following steps were used in conducting the present investigation regarding early childhood education for disadvantaged children:

1. Current literature relevant to early childhood education for disadvantaged children was reviewed with particular attention given to research studies concerning Projects Head Start and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

2. Officials from the National Office of Child Development and the U. S. Office of Education's Division of Compensatory Education were consulted concerning the appropriateness of the study and the feasibility of completing it.

3. A five-page question-guide was designed for use as the data gathering instrument.

4. The question-guide was field-tested on several individuals who were considered closely associated with the nature of the study. (See sample of question-guide in Appendix A.)

5. A letter was sent to school districts formerly requesting their cooperation in obtaining the necessary data to complete the study. (See Appendix B.)

6. Follow-up telephone calls were made for the purpose

of confirming participation and for scheduling interviews.

7. Personal interviews were conducted by the writer with an accompanying question-guide.

8. The responses were edited, tabulated, and summarized according to the following manner:

   a. Data were coded and key punched on IBM Key Punch cards which provided tabulation.

   b. Analysis was made from data.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Since the evidence and tabulated results for the various parts of the problem were given in Chapter IV, the most significant points are merely brought together in a summary list in this chapter.

1. The evidence of current literature as presented in Chapter II combined with the data collected in this study indicated that educators were aware of the need for early intervention, particularly for disadvantaged children. Title I directors (or appropriate school officials) were asked to respond to direct questions concerning changes which reflected a concern for early intervention; and the following positive findings were revealed:

   a. All twenty school districts have extended their

curricula since the introduction of these projects to include children at an earlier age.

b. Eight of these districts have initial pilot Kindergarten programs for the first time.

c. In six school districts, the Kindergarten program has been expanded to include all children in the districts.

d. Four school districts have implemented prekindergarten programs.

e. Three school districts have developed outdoor science curricula for primary age children.

2. The data found in Chapter IV indicated that since the beginning of Project Head Start, there have been some basic changes in the twenty school districts under study. The data supported the fact that there were some marked educational changes within these school systems which were closely associated with activities initiated by Project Head Start. For example, the creation and involvement of parents on Policy Advisory Boards; the provision of free lunches for children and parents; the participation of parents in the selections of staff; and the utilization of paid and non-paid classroom volunteers were all an integrated part of the Title I project.

It is noteworthy, however, that the above activities are mandated by federal guidelines for Head Start,[1] but not so for Title I, which is funded by a different federal act.[2] It was particulary encouraging to note that in this investigation, the above activities were important features in all projects observed. Further, the increased number of paraprofessionals found in Title I projects was another indication of Head Start's influence. Again, it is the policy for Head Start to employ paraprofessionals as classroom and community aides, whereas Title I is not obligated to employ paraprofessionals; nevertheless, to a large degree, paraprofessionals were found employed in each Title I school district under investigation.

3. Head Start placed a high value on its nutrition program. Each child who participated in the project had at least one full meal per day, namely, lunch. In addition, 50 percent of all Head Start children were served breakfast. Federal guidelines require at least one meal per day for each Head Start participant. Approximately 30 percent of the Title I participants received free lunches. Breakfast pro-

---

[1]See Appendix C for specific guideline for Head Start.

[2]See Footnote 5, Chapter I.

grams were initiated as small pilot programs in 40 percent of the Title I projects. When parents of the children in the program were questioned about the nutrition program, they confirmed that it existed; and they viewed the program as a highly essential part of both projects.

4. Significant evidence from this investigation revealed that in approximately five years, Head Start and Title I projects have developed a close working relationship in an effort to coordinate resources. The following information was found:

   a. The school systems responsible for implementing Title I were utilizing demographic data collected by Head Start staff, and both programs were sharing information on children.

   b. Administrative procedures were developed to facilitate systematic communication in approximately 80 percent of all projects observed.

   c. Approximately 80 percent of all projects participated in some form of joint in-service training. There existed an average of two college credited courses per school district. Staffs from both projects attended these classes.

   d. Governing boards had developed policy state-

ments pledging cooperation between projects in 90 percent of the school districts under study.

5. The results of the data gathered on the extent of parent involvement included perceptions of parents who had children enrolled in the projects, in addition to information obtained from project directors. It must be pointed out that parent participation is an important concept to place in perspective in this study. The impact of parents upon the educational changes found in this investigation was most encouraging. Results revealed that Head Start's influence was positively related to an increased number of persons from poor communities who worked in the school districts as volunteers and/or paid community aides (many of whom were parents of children in the project). There was an average of sixty volunteers and six community aides per Head Start project, whereas Title I averaged fifty-four volunteers and approximately six community aides. The organization of Policy Advisory Boards, where parents played a significant role, was evident. It was found that 80 percent of Title I projects observed had boards. This was encouraging because, unlike Head Start, Title I projects were not required by national guidelines to have advisory boards. Parents constituted an average of 54 percent of the membership on

each advisory board in the Title I projects, while Head Start averaged 65 percent parent membership in each community under study. It was also reported that these boards approved proposals before they were submitted for refunding in approximately 90 percent of all projects observed. Further, it was reported that approximately five parents from Head Start and two parents from Title I in each community served as officers on their respective advisory boards.

6. The perceptions of the twenty parents who were interviewed were most interesting, and the writer gained a deeper understanding from them of their feelings about these projects in their communities. The following comments and impressions were made by parents of children who participated in the projects observed:

   a. Parents agreed with directors that there had been an increased amount of parent participation since the inception of Head Start. One was recorded as saying, "We have never before been thought about." Another stated, "It's great to give the school folk some of your mind." The final comment recorded summarizes the general attitude of most parents who participated. It was made by a mother of seven. She stated that,

"These programs have made us, over on this side of town, feel like new people. Our children feel like they are now somebody. I believe this is because they are beginning to do some things we've been wanting a long time ago. You better believe, I speak my piece when I go over there (to the school). I just wish I had had a say-so when my two oldest boys were in _____ school. Maybe they would have turned out to be different." (The oldest children referred to were in school from 1954 through 1963.)

b. Parents generally agreed with directors about their involvement; however, the statistical data at times differ. This was attributed to the fact that directors often were quoting from factual data concerning the projects, whereas parent responses were based on their actual experiences through involvement. From the results reported in Chapter IV, one can truly say that parents were extremely knowledgable about both Head Start and Title I. This, in itself, reflects the nature and extent of continued parent involvement in the operational aspects of the various projects under investigation.

7. It is important for the reader to view the above edu-

cational changes as being consistent with the major aims and objectives of Head Start and highly associated with activities initiated by Head Start. In the review of the literature, one could clearly find evidence that since 1965 there have been some significant changes and an increased interest in early childhood education, particularly for young disadvantaged children. Evidence in Chapter II supports this statement. Finally, for social scientists, educators, and researchers, much remains to be done. It was pleasing to find, however, that at least a "head start" has been made in an area which warrants much attention in the future.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on findings of previous research studies disclosed in both the review of professional literature and the findings revealed in the current investigation:

1. If school systems are to provide improved early childhood education programs for children from disadvantaged backgrounds, each school system should begin by carefully analyzing and measuring its present curricula as related to activities emphasized in the projects in this study (e.g., concern for nutrition, early intervention, social services,

parent involvement, and community involvement). These concepts are essential for early development in the learning process. Persons engaged in revising or developing programs for young children, particularly those from poor communities, may find useful data revealed in this study which relates to many aspects of program development in early childhood education.

2. Further research is needed to determine the adequacy of current measuring instruments for children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Based upon the researcher's personal knowledge of the available instruments and studies in the review of the literature in Chapter II, it seems fair to state that tests now utilized are not suitable instruments. In addition to a careful assessment of current instruments, there should be some consideration given to the development of new measuring devices for use with the disadvantaged.

3. Head Start's basic guidelines (see Appendix C) issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare clearly defined areas of emphasis for program implementation. Although Title I projects seem to be adopting many features of these guidelines voluntarily, the researcher feels that Head

Start and Title I are designed to serve the same purpose and often the same population, and therefore guidelines for both programs should be uniform. This could be brought about by the Office of Child Development. Federal operating agencies should jointly develop a single set of guidelines to serve this purpose.

4. Considering the evidence revealed by previous research and findings from this study, there is a need to be assured that all kindergarten-age children are enrolled in school. The importance researchers placed on early development is evident. The inconsistency of children entering school is considered a weakness in our educational system. It is recommended, therefore, that federal lawmakers pass legislation and/or strongly urge states to make early entrance mandatory. Further, the writer recommends that federal assistance be given to all communities needing help in establishing Kindergarten programs, thereby providing funds for initial implementation.

5. The data in this study revealed that parent participation played a significant role in bridging the gap between school and community residents. Evidence indicated that parents had a definite impact

on changes found in the districts under study. To fully develop this alliance between parents, community residents, and educators, the writer recommends that:

a. Pilot studies be carefully designed to determine the degree of parent and community involvement and to explore ways of effecting such involvement.

b. Funds in federal projects such as Head Start, Title I, and Follow-Through should be designated for parent and community participation.

6. The data from this study revealed that Title I was not consistent in its nutrition program. Approximately 30 percent of its participants received at least one free meal per day. In view of the fact that Head Start feeds 100 percent of its participants at least one meal per day, and approximately 50 percent two meals, further study should be made of this apparent discrepancy. Since children are from basically the same families and/or communities, it seems that similar needs should exist. It is recommended that officials from local communities study carefully the children in need and make provisions for a continuation of this vital program component.

7. Previous research also provided convincing evidence that there is an urgent need for more exploratory studies to enhance the general knowledge concerning programs for young disadvantaged children. New approaches to learning must be fully explored. It is clear that there is confusion on the question of how to meet most effectively the needs of disadvantaged children and their families.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWS

1.1.2.3 _____ Have additional health services been made available to program participants?

1.1.2.0 _____ How many social workers have been employed?

1.1.2.3 _____ How many community workers have been employed?

1.1.2.0 _____ How many psychologists have been employed?

1.1.2.0 _____ How many volunteer resource agencies have offered their services to the program?

1.1.2.3 _____ Is a free lunch program available to parent participants?

1.1.2.3 _____ Has a breakfast program been instituted?

1.1.2.3 _____ How many non-paid classroom volunteers have been utilized?

1.0.2.0 _____ Has the curriculum been extended to include pupil enrollment at an earlier age since 1965?

1.0.2.0 _____ How many early childhood specialists have been employed to help teachers in carrying out their instructional program?

1.0.2.0 _____ Has the ratio of paraprofessionals to regular professional employees been increased?

1.0.2.0 _____ Has a modified curriculum been rewritten into behavioral terms?

1.0.2.0 _____ Does the modified curriculum include an enrichment phase?

1.0.2.0 _____ Has the instructional program been increased to include new materials?

1.0.2.0 _____ Has the instructional program been increased to include new equipment?

2.1.2.0 _____ Do Head Start personnel use the same forms as the regular school personnel to record initial data?

2.1.2.3 _____ Is demographic information obtained for program participants by methods other than a standard inter-agency form?

2.1.2.0 _____ How many visitations between programs have been scheduled on a regular basis throughout the school year?

2.1.2.0 _____ Is there an inter-program schedule for transmitting data concerning children entering public school?

2.1.2.0 _____ Are there administrative procedures in opération which facilitate systematic communication from one program to another?

2.1.2.0 _____ How many times have directors been invited to the public schools' administrative staff meetings on a regular basis?

2.1.2.0 _____ Is data filed where it is easily accessible to staff members?

2.1.2.3 _____ How many credited courses have been made available for participants from both programs?

2.1.2.0 _____ Do you conduct joint in-service training programs?

2.1.2.0 _____ About how many joint conferences concerning children moving from Head Start to regular school programs were held during the past year?

2.1.2.0 _____ Has the governing board developed a policy statement pledging cooperation between the two programs?

3.1.2.3 _____ Since the inception of Head Start, has parent involvement increased?

3.1.2.3 _____ In your opinion, what percent of families serviced by the program are received favorably by related community agencies?

3.1.2.3 _____ How many parents observe in the classroom on an unscheduled basis?

3.1.2.3 _____ What percent of parents are members of the Policy Advisory Board?

3.1.2.3 _____ How many parents of children in the program are serving in classrooms as volunteers?

3.1.2.3 _____ How many parents are involved in the preparation of the proposal?

3.1.2.3 _____ How many parents are involved in the selection of staff members?

3.1.2.3 _____ Does the Policy Advisory Board approve the proposal before it is submitted for funding?

3.1.2.3 _____ About how many home visits are made during a school year?

2.1.2.0 _____ About how many times during the past school year were joint meetings between programs held? [staff members from both programs]

2.1.2.0 _____ About how many parents are included in joint conferences concerning children moving from Head Start to the regular school programs?

1.1.2.0 _____ About how many program children have free lunch provision?

3.1.2.3 _____ How often do school personnel attend activities in the school's community which are not initiated by the school?

3.1.2.3 _____ About how often are parents invited to your school (P. T. A. meetings excluded)?

3.1.2.0 _____ How many parents of children in the program are employed by your agency?

3.1.2.3 _____ What percent of staff time is spent informing parents in the program about community services?

3.1.2.3 _____ How many parents of children in the program hold office on the Policy Advisory Board?

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Amherst 01002

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PROJECT OFFICIAL

Dear Mr. _____:

This letter is to confirm the dates which we agreed upon in our telephone conversation yesterday. As indicated, I will be in your school district on September 28th and 29th to conduct personal interviews with you, the director of Head Start, and a parent of one child who has participated in Head Start and/or Title I.

This research study has been designed to obtain the comments and observations of persons who have had substantial experience in the above projects. Therefore, I would like to draw upon the knowledge of persons from your school district. As stated to you by phone, this study might possibly reveal significant information concerning the various aspects of the impact of these projects and their future developments.

The name of your school district will not be identified nor will it be described in any way in this study. Should you desire to have a copy of the Summary of Findings of the study, I will be happy to send one at the earliest possible date.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

CORNELL T. LEWIS

APPENDIX C - HEW GUIDELINES FOR PROJECT HEAD START

OCD-HS TRANSMITTAL NOTICE - HEAD START POLICY MANUAL 70.2

GENERAL SERIES 8/10/70

WHAT WE ARE SENDING

Instruction I-31, Section B 2, The Parents

MANUAL MATERIAL TO BE REPLACED

Head Start Policy Manual Part B, Section 2, pages 10, 11, 12, dated September, 1967

WHAT YOU SHOULD DO

Remove above pages relating to parents from the Head Start Policy Manual dated September 1967. File attached material in loose leaf notebook.

BACKGROUND

This section has been revised to clarify the intention of HEW and OEO to facilitate the involvement of parents of Head Start children "...in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level."[1] These guidelines have been developed in response to the numerous requests received during the past three years from Head Start parents, staff and administrators for more specific delineation of their functions and responsibilities in local programs.

It must be emphasized that this revised section presents minimal requirements only, and are not intended to reduce the level of participation in those programs which have surpassed the minimum standards. Please note page 5, section C, FUNCTIONS: "Local groups may negotiate for additional functions and a greater share of responsibility if all parties agree."

If Head Start children are to reach their fullest potential there must be an opportunity for Head Start parents to influence the character of programs affecting the development of their children. The organizational structure of every Head Start program must provide this opportunity by increasing the effectiveness of parent participation in the planning and implementation of programs on the local level, in order that parents may also become more effective in bringing about positive change in the lives of their children.

---

[1] Public Law 90-22, December 23, 1967, Part B, Section 222, (1) (B).

Distribution: HS-FHS, HS-SHS, HS-HRTO, HS-SECO, HS-HSTP

Policy-setting bodies will now be called Policy Committees or Councils. Another change is the inclusion of charts which assign specific functions and responsibilities for the major parties involved. These charts are not to be used separately, but only in conjunction with the narrative portion.

Translating these revised policies into practice in local programs is the responsibility of Head Start Directors, staff and parents. If the task of implementing them is approached in a spirit of mutual understanding and partnership among all parties, we are confident that the result will be the improvement of the quality and effectiveness of all the components of Head Start, and increased benefits to Head Start children.

I-30-2 THE PARENTS

A. INTRODUCTION

Head Start believes that the gains made by the child in Head Start must be understood and built upon by the family and the community. To achieve this goal, Head Start provides for the involvement of the child's parents and other members of the family in the experiences he receives in the child development center by giving them many opportunities for a richer appreciation of the young child's needs and how to satisfy them.

Many of the benefits of Head Start are rooted in "change". These changes must take place in the family itself, in the community, and in the attitudes of people and institutions that have an impact on both.

It is clear that the success of Head Start in bringing about substantial changes demands the fullest involvement of the parents, parental-substitutes, and families of children enrolled in its programs. This involvement begins when a Head Start program begins and should gain vigor and vitality as planning and activities go forward.

Successful parental involvement enters into every part of Head Start, influences other anti-poverty programs, helps bring about changes in institutions in the community, and works toward altering the social conditions that have formed the systems that surround the economically disadvantaged child and his family.

Project Head Start must continue to discover new ways for parents to become deeply involved in decision-making about the program and in the development of activities that they deem helpful and important in meeting their particular needs and conditions. For some parents, participation may begin on a simple level and move to more complex levels. For other parents the movement will be immediate, because of past experiences, into complex levels of sharing and giving. Every Head Start program is obligated to provide the channels through which such participation and involvement can be provided for and enriched.

Unless this happens, the goals of Head Start will not be achieved and the program itself will remain a creative experience for the preschool child in a setting that is not reinforced by needed changes in social systems into which the child will move after his Head Start experience.

This sharing in decisions for the future is one of the primary aims of parent participation and involvement in Project Head Start.

B. THE ROLE OF THE PARENTS

EVERY HEAD START PROGRAM MUST HAVE EFFECTIVE PARENT PARTICIPATION. There are at least four major kinds of parent participation in local Head Start programs.

1. PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS OF MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT THE NATURE AND OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM.

2. PARTICIPATION IN THE CLASSROOM AS PAID EMPLOYEES, VOLUNTEERS OR OBSERVERS.

3. ACTIVITIES FOR THE PARENTS WHICH THEY HAVE HELPED TO DEVELOP.

4. WORKING WITH THEIR CHILDREN IN COOPERATION WITH THE STAFF OF THE CENTER.

Each of these is essential to an effective Head Start program both at the grantee level and the delegate agency level. Every Head Start program must hire/designate a Coordinator of Parent Activities to help bring about appropriate parent participation. This staff member may be a volunteer in smaller communities.

1. PARENT PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS OF MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT THE NATURE AND OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

HEAD START POLICY GROUPS

a. Structure

The formal structure by which parents can participate in policy making and operation of the program will vary with the local administrative structure of the program.

Normally, however, the Head Start policy groups will consist of the following:

1. Head Start Center Committee. This committee must be set up at the center level. Where centers have several classes, it is recommended that there also be parent class committees.

2. Head Start Policy Committee. This committee must be set up at the delegate agency level when the program is administered in whole or in part by such agencies.

3. Head Start Policy Council. This Council must be set up at the grantee level.

When a grantee has delegated the entire Head Start program to one Delegate Agency, it is not necessary to have a Policy Council in addition to a Delegate Agency Policy Committee. Instead one policy group serves both the Grantee Board and the Delegate Agency Board.

b. Composition

Chart A describes the composition of each of these groups.

CHART A

Organization	Composition
1. Head Start Center Committee	1. Parents whose children are enrolled in that center.
2. Head Start Policy Committee (delegate agency)	2. At least 50% parents of Head Start children presently enrolled in that delegate agency program plus representatives of the community*
3. Head Start Policy Council (grantee)	3. At least 50% parents of Head Start children presently enrolled in that grantee's program plus representatives of the community**

*Representatives of the Community (Delegate Agency level): A representative of neighborhood community groups (public and private) and of local neighborhood community or professional organizations, which have a concern for children of low income families and can contribute to the development of the program. The number of such representatives will vary depending on the number of organizations which should appropriately be represented. The Delegate Agency determines the composition of their committee (within the above guidelines) and methods to be used in selecting representatives of the community. Parents of former Head Start children may serve as representatives of the community on delegate agency policy groups. All representatives of the community selected by the agency must be approved by elected parent members of the committee. In no case, however, should representatives of the community exceed 50% of the total committee.

**Representatives of the Community (Grantee Agency level): A representative of major agencies, (public and private) and major community civic or professional organizations which have a concern for children of low income families and can contribute to the program. The number of such representatives will vary, depending on the number of organizations which should appropriately be represented. The applicant agency determines the composition of the council (within the above guidelines) and the methods to be used in selecting representatives of the community. Parents of former Head Start children may serve as representatives of the community on grantee agency policy groups. All representatives of the community selected by the agency must be approved by elected parent members of the committee. In no case, however, should representatives of the community exceed 50% of the total committee or council.

SPECIAL NOTES

1. All parents serving on policy groups must be elected by parents of Head Start children currently enrolled in the program.

2. It is strongly recommended that the community action agency board have representation from the Head Start Policy Council to assure coordination of Head Start activities with other CAA programs. Conversely, community action agency board representation on the Policy Council is also recommended.

3. It is important that the membership of policy groups be rotated to assure a regular influx of new ideas into the program. For this purpose, terms of membership must be limited to no more than three years.

4. No staff member (nor members of their families as defined in CAP Memo 23A) of the applicant or delegate agencies shall serve on the council or committee in a voting capacity. Staff members may attend the meetings of councils or committees in a consultative non-voting capacity upon request of the council or committee.

5. Every corporate board operating a Head Start program must have a Policy Committee or Council as defined by HEW. The corporate body and the Policy Committee or Council must not be one and the same.

6. Policy groups for summer programs present a special problem because of the difficulty of electing parent representatives in advance. Therefore, the policy group for one summer program must remain in office until its successors have been elected and taken office. The group from the former program should meet frequently between the end of the program and the election of new members to assure some measure of program continuity. These meetings should be for the purpose of (a) assuring appropriate follow up of the children (b) aiding the the development of the upcoming summer Head Start program, (c) writing of the application, (d) hiring of the director and establishment of criteria for hiring staff and, when necessary (e) orientation of the new members. In short, the policy group from a former program must not be dissolved until a new group is elected. The expertise of those parents who have previously served should be used whenever possible.

c. FUNCTIONS

The following paragraphs and charts describe the minimum functions and degrees of responsibility for the various policy groups involved in administration of local Head Start programs. Local groups may negotiate for additional functions and a greater share of responsibility if all parties agree. All such agreements are subject to such limitations as may be called for by OEO or HEW policy. Questions about this should be referred to your HEW regional office.

1) The Head Start Center Committee shall carry out at least the following minimum responsibilities:

a) Assists teacher, center director, and all other persons responsible for the development and operation of every component including curriculum in the Head Start program.

b) Works closely with classroom teachers and all other component staff to carry out the daily activities program.

c) Plans, conducts, and participates in informal as well as formal programs and activities for center parents and staff.

d) Participates in recruiting and screening of center employees within guidelines established by OEO/HEW, the Grantee Council and Board, and Delegate Agency Committee and Board.

2) The Head Start Policy Committee. Chart B outlines the major management functions connected with local Head Start program administered by delegate agencies and the degree of responsibility assigned to each participating group.

In addition to those listed functions, the committee shall:

a) Serve as a link between public and private organizations, the grantee Policy Council, the Delegate Agency Board of Directors, and the community it serves.

b) Have the opportunity to initiate suggestions and ideas for program improvements and to receive a report on action taken by the administering agency with regard to its recommendations.

c) Plan, coordinate and organize agency-wide activities for parents with the assistance of staff.

d) Assist in communicating with parents and encouraging their participation in the program.

e) Aid in recruiting volunteer services from parents, community residents and community organizations, and assist in the mobilization of community resources to meet identified needs.

f) Administer the Parent Activity funds.

3) The Head Start Policy Council. Chart C outlines the major management functions connected with the Head Start program at the grantee level, whether it be a community action or limited purpose agency, and the degree of responsibility assigned to each participating group.

In addition to those listed functions, the Council shall:

a) Serve as a link between public and private organizations, the Delegate Agency Policy Committees, Neighborhood Councils, the Grantee Board of Directors and the community it serves.

b) Have the opportunity to initiate suggestions and ideas for program improvements and to receive a report on action taken by the administering agency with regard to its recommendations.

c) Plan, coordinate and organize agency-wide activities for parents with the assistance of staff.

d) Approve the selection of Delegate Agencies.

e) Recruit volunteer services from parents, community residents and community organizations, and mobilizes community resources to meet identified needs.

f) Distribute Parent Activity funds to Policy Committees.

It may not be easy for Head Start directors and professional staff to share responsibility when decisions must be made. Even when they are committed to involving parents, the Head Start staff must take care to avoid dominating meetings by force of their greater training and experience in the process of decision-making. At these meetings, professionals may be tempted to do most of the talking. They must learn to ask parents for their ideas, and listen with attention, patience and understanding. Self-confidence and self-respect are powerful motivating forces. Activities which bring out these qualities in parents can prove invaluable in improving family life of young children from low income homes.

Members of Head Start Policy Groups whose family income falls below the "poverty line index" may receive meeting allowances or be reimbursed for travel, per diem, meal and baby sitting expenses incurred because of Policy Group meetings. The procedures necessary to secure reimbursement funds and their regulations are detailed in OEO Instruction #6803-1.

2. PARTICIPATION IN THE CLASSROOM AS PAID EMPLOYEES, VOLUNTEERS OR OBSERVERS

Head Start classes must be open to parents at times reasonable and convenient to them. There are very few occasions when the presence of a limited number of parents would present any problem in operation of the program.

Having parents in the classroom has three advantages. It:

a. gives the parents a better understanding of what the center is doing for the children and the kinds of home assistance they may require.

b. shows the child the depth of his parents concern.

c. gives the staff an opportunity to know the parents better and to learn from them.

There are, of course, many center activities outside the classroom (e.g., field trips, clinic visits, social occasions) in which the presence of parents is equally desirable.

Parents are one of the categories of persons who must receive preference for employment as non-professionals. Participation as volunteers may also be possible for many parents. Experience obtained as a volunteer may be helpful in qualifying for non-professional employment. At a minimum parents should be encouraged to observe classes several times. In order to permit fathers to observe it might be a good idea to have some parts of the program in the evening or on weekends.

Head Start Centers are encouraged to set aside space within the Center which can be used by parents for meetings and staff conferences.

3. ACTIVITIES FOR PARENTS WHICH THEY HAVE HELPED TO DEVELOP

Head Start programs must develop a plan for parent education programs which are responsive to needs expressed by the parents themselves. Other community agencies should be encouraged to assist in the planning and implementation of these programs.

Parents may also wish to work together on community problems of common concern, such as health, housing, education and welfare and to sponsor activities and programs around interests expressed by the group. Policy Committees must anticipate such needs when developing program proposals and include parent activity funds to cover the cost of parent sponsored activities.

4. WORKING WITH THEIR CHILDREN IN THEIR OWN HOME IN CONNECTION WITH THE STAFF OF THE CENTER

HEW requires that each grantee make home visits a part of its program when parents permit such visits. Teachers should visit parents of summer children a minimum of once; in full year programs there should be at least three visits, if the parents have consented to such home visits. In those rare cases where a double shift has been approved for teachers it may be necessary to use other types of personnel to make home visits. Personnel such as teacher aides, health aides and social workers may also make home visits with, or independently of, the teaching staff but coordinated through the parent program staff in order to eliminate uncoordinated visits.

Head Start staff should develop activities to be used at home by other family members that will reinforce and support the child's total Head Start experience.

Staff, parents and children will all benefit from home visits and activities. Grantees shall not require that parents permit home visits as a condition of the child's participation in Head Start. However, every effort must be made to explain the advantages of visits to parents.

DEFINITIONS AS USED ON CHARTS B AND C

A - General Responsibility

The individual or group with legal and fiscal responsibility guides and directs the carrying out of the function described through the person or group given operating responsibility.

B - Operating Responsibility

The individual or group that is directly responsible for carrying out or performing the function, consistent with the general guidance and direction of the individual or group holding general responsibility.

C - Must Approve or Disapprove

The individual or group (other than persons or groups holding general and operating responsibility, A and B above) must approve before the decision is finalized or action taken. The individual or group must also have been consulted in the decision making process prior to the point of seeking approval.

If they do not approve, the proposal cannot be adopted, or the proposed action taken, until agreement is reached between the disagreeing groups or individuals.

D - Must be Consulted

The individual or group must be called upon before any decision is made or approval is granted to give advice or information but not to make the decision or grant approval.

E - May be Consulted

The individual or group may be called upon for information, advice or recommendations by those individuals or groups having general responsibility or operating responsibility.

A = General Responsibility
B = Operating Responsibility
C = Must Approve or Disapprove
D = Must be Consulted
E = May be Consulted

FUNCTION	Chart B – Delegate Agency				Chart C – Grantee Agency			
	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Committee	Head Start Director	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Council	Head Start Director
I. PLANNING								
(a) Identify child development needs in the area to be served (by CAA if not delegated)	A	B	D	D	A	B	D	D
(b) Establish goals of Head Start Program and develop ways to meet them within HEW guidelines	A	C	C	B	A	C	C	B
(c) Determine Delegate Agencies and areas in the community in which Head Start Programs will operate	-	-	-	-	A	D	C	B
(d) Determine location of centers or classes	A	D	C	B	-	-	-	-
(e) Develop plans to use all available community resources in Head Start	A	D	C	B	A	D	C	B

A = General Responsibility
B = Operating Responsibility
C = Must Approve or Disapprove
D = Must be Consulted
E = May be Consulted

FUNCTION	Chart B – Delegate Agency				Chart C – Grantee Agency			
	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Committee	Head Start Director	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Council	Head Start Director
I. PLANNING - Continued								
(f) Establish criteria for selection of children within applicable laws and HEW guidelines	-	-	-	-	A	C	C	B
(g) Develop plan for recruitment of children	A	C	C	B	-	-	-	-
II. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION								
(a) Determine the composition of the appropriate Policy Group and the method for setting it up (within HEW guidelines)	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
(b) Determine what services should be provided to Head Start from the CAA Central Office and the neighborhood centers	-	-	-	-	A	B	C	D

A = General Responsibility
B = Operating Responsibility
C = Must Approve or Disapprove
D = Must be Consulted
E = May be Consulted

FUNCTION	Chart B — Delegate Agency: Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Committee	Head Start Director	Chart C — Grantee Agency: Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Council	Head Start Director
II. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION - Continued								
(c) Determine what services should be provided to Head Start from Delegate Agency	A.	B	C	D	-	-	-	-
(d) Establish a method of hearing and resolving community complaints about the Head Start program	D	C	A	B	D	C	A	B
(e) Direct the CAA Head Start staff in day to day operations	-	-	-	-	E	A	E	B
(f) Direct the Delegate Agency H/S staff in day to day operations	E	A	E	B	-	-	-	-
(g) Ensure that standards for acquiring space, equipment and supplies are met	A	D	D	B	A	D	D	B

A = General Responsibility
B = Operating Responsibility
C = Must Approve or Disapprove
D = Must be Consulted
E = May be Consulted

FUNCTION	Chart B — Delegate Agency				Chart C — Grantee Agency			
	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Committee	Head Start Director	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Council	Head Start Director
III. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION								
(a) Determine Head Start personnel policies (including establishment of hiring and firing criteria for H/S staff, career development plans and employee grievance procedures)								
Grantee agency- -	-	-	-	-	A	C	C	B
Delegate agency- -	A	C	C	B	-	-	-	-
(b) Hire and fire H/S Director of Grantee Agency	-	-	-	-	A	B	C	-
(c) Hire and fire H/S staff of Grantee Agency	-	-	-	-	E	A	C	B
(d) Hire and fire H/S Director of Delegate Agency	A	B	C	-	-	-	-	-
(e) Hire and fire H/S staff of Delegate Agency	E	A	C	B	-	-	-	-

TN-70.2 (8/10/70)

A = General Responsibility
B = Operating Responsibility
C = Must Approve or Disapprove
D = Must be Consulted
E = May be Consulted

FUNCTION	Chart B: Delegate Agency				Chart C: Grantee Agency			
	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Committee	Head Start Director	Board	Executive Director	Head Start Policy Council	Head Start Director
IV. GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS								
(a) Prepare request for funds and proposed work program								
Prior to sending to CAA- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	A	C	C	B	-	-	-	-
Prior to sending to HEW- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	-	-	-	-	A	C	C	B
(b) Make major changes in budget and work program while program is in operation	A	C	C	B	A	C	C	B
(c) Provide information needed for pre-review to Policy Council	A	D	C	B	-	-	-	-
(d) Provide information needed for pre-review to HEW	-	-	-	-	A	D	C	B
V. EVALUATION								
Conduct self-evaluation of agency's H/S program	A	D	B	D	A	D	B	D

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

Cicirelli, Victor G., et al. The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development, Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio University under Contract B89-4536, June 20, 1968 with the Office of Economic Opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Cline, Marvin G., and Dickey, Marguerite. "An Evaluation and Follow-Up Study of Summer 1966 Head Start Children in Washington, D. C." Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Coleman, James S., et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Foley, Walter J. Pupil, Staff, and Educational Facility Characteristics, Associated with Public Law 89-10 Title I Projects in Iowa. University of Iowa Contract No. 3-6-001043 1514. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Hayden, Robert G. et al. A National Survey of the Impact of Head Start on Community Institutions. OEO Contract No. B894638. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Mosback, E.J. et al. Analyses of Compensatory Education in Five School Districts. Tempo, General Electric Company. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968. p. 24.

Report Prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by a Panel of Authorities on Child Development, Robert Cooke, Chairman. Number 923454. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Title One, Year II. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1968.

U. S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities. Desegregation Under Law - Part 3A. 91st Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Books

Almy, Millie. Children's Experiences Prior to First Grade and Success in Beginning Reading. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.

Bereiter, Carl. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Bloom, Benjamin S., et al. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. New York: Random House, Inc., 1960.

Douglas, J.W.B. The Home and The School. London: McGibbon and Kee, 1964.

Fantini, Mario D., et al. The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education, New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Ferman, Louis; Kornbluh, Joyce; and Haber, Alan. Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Fuller, James L. Behavior Genetics. New York: Wiley, 1960.

Hunt, John McV. Intelligence and Experience. New York: Ronald, 1961.

Leeper, Sarah R., et al. Good Schools for Young Children. New York: Macmillian Company, 1968.

Periodicals

Baratz, Joan C., and Stephen S. "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," Harvard Educational Review, 40, 1, 1970.

Beller, Kuno. "Study I: Use of Multiple Criteria to Evaluate Effects of Early Educational Intervention on Subsequent School Performance," New York: Free Press, 1968.

Cawley, James et al. "An Appraisal of Head Start Participants and Non-Participants: Expanded Considerations on Learning Disabilities," Harvard Educational Review, 39, 3, 1969.

Cohen, David, K. "Compensation and Integration," Harvard Educational Review, 38, 3, 1968.

Hunt, John McV. "Comments on Jensen," Harvard Educational Review, 40, 1, 1969.

Jensen, Arthur R. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, 39, 3, 1968.

Kagan, Jerome. "Comments on Jensen," Harvard Educational Review, 40, 1, 1969.

Sigel, Irving E., and McBane, Bonnie. "The Relationship Between Cognitive Competence and Level of Symbolization Among Five-Year-Old Children," In J. Hellmuth (ed.), Disadvantaged Child, 1, 1967.

Smith, Marshall S., and Bissell, Joan S. "The Impact of Head Start: The Westinghouse-Ohio Head Start Evaluation," Harvard Educational Review, 40, 1970.

Stern, Carolyn. "Comparative Effectiveness of Echoic and Modeling Procedures in Language Instruction with Culturally Disadvantaged Children," Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Swift, J.W. "Effects of Early Group Experience: The Nursery School and Day Nursery," Review of Child Development Research, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

ERIC Clearinghouse Publications

Alexander, Theron. "The Language of the Children in the 'Inner City'," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1968.

Chorost, Sherwood B., et al. "An Evaluation of the Effects of a Summer Head Start Program," Childhood Research Information Bulletin, ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1967.

Faust, Margaret. "Five Pilot Studies: Concerned with Social-Emotional Variables Affecting Behavior of Children in Head Start," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1968.

Franklin, Margaret, and Cobb, Judith. "Document 3: An Experimental Approach to Studying Non-Verbal Representation in Young Children," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1967.

Harding, John. "A Comparative Study of Various Project Head Start Programs," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1966.

Hubbard, James. "An Exploratory Study of Oral Language Development Among Culturally Different Children," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1967.

Johnson, Henry, and Palomares, Uvaldo. "A Study of Some Ecological, Economic and Social Factors Influencing Parental Participation in Project Head Start," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1966.

Karnes, Merle B., et al. "A Longitudinal Study of Disadvantaged Children Who Participated in Three Different Preschool Programs," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1969.

Schwartz, J. Conrad. "Presence of An Attached Peer and Security in A Novel Environment," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1968.

Wolff, Max, and Stein, Annie. "Study I: Six Months Later. A Comparison of Children Who Had Head Start Summer 1965, with Their Classmates in Kindergarten (A Case Study of Kindergartens in Four Public Elementary Schools, New York City)," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1966.

Zimiles, Herbert, and Asch, Harvey. "Document I: Development of the Matrix Test," ERIC Clearinghouse, Urbana, Ill., 1967.

Pamphlets and Reports

Curwood, Sarah T. "A Survey and Evaluation of Project Head Start as Established and Operated in Communities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts During the Summer of 1965," Mass. Comm. on Children & Youth, 1965.

Deutsch, Martin. "Final Report," Institute for Developmental Studies, New York, 1968.

Gray, Susan, and Klaus, Rupert. "The Early Training Project: A Seventh Year Report," George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, 1969.

Grotberg, Edith. Review of Research: 1965 to 1969. OEO Pamphlet 1608-13, 1969.

Jordan, Daniel C. Compensatory Education in Massachusetts: An Evaluation with Recommendations, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., 1970.

Kincheloe, James B. The Impact of Title I Upon the Administrative Operations of Four Rural Economically Depressed, and Culturally Deprived School Districts, University of Iowa Contract No. 600127-0946, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1967.

Nimnicht, Glen; Meier, John; and McAfee, Oralie. Research on The New Nursery School: Interim Report, Far West Laboratory, Palo Alto, California, 1967.

Preliminary Report of the Ad Hoc Joint Committee on the Preparation of Nursery and Kindergarten Teachers, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1969.

Report of the President's Task Force on Education, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1969.

A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in Public Schools, 1, 1967.

TITLE I ESEA, A Review and a Forward Look, Report, National Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D. C., 1969.

TITLE I ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children, A Report by the Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., 1966.

Unpublished Materials

Hutchinson, Thomas E. "Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts," Unpublished Paper, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., 1969.

Jencks, Christopher. "Some Natural Experiments in Compensatory Education," Mimeo: Paper presented at SRCD Meeting, April 15, 1969.

McDill, Edward L.; McDill, Mary S.; and Sprehe, J. Timothy. "An Analysis of Evaluations of Selected Compensatory Education Programs," Mimeo: Paper presented at the Evaluation of Social Action Programs Conference, May 2-3, 1969.

Miller, James O. Diffusion of Intervention Effects in Disadvantaged Families. ERIC Occasional Paper, Urbana, Ill., 1969.

Other Sources

Address by James E. Allen, Jr., before Annual Medalist Dinner of the New York Academy of Public Education, Biltmore Hotel, New York, N. Y., May 20, 1969.

Press Release by Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C., December 2, 1968.

Statement by Harold Howe II, U. S. Commissioner of Education, issued in Washington, D. C., November 18, 1968.